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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

"I know you can do it! You're wasting your life without that dissertation! You come back to State and work with me, and I'll get you through!"

When Jeff was serving his residency and was taking generals, he had attended Professor X's classes. Now as a part-time consultant with the public schools, Professor X encountered Jeff at work as a vocational supervisor. Ever since Jeff was 24 attaining the Ph.D. was his Dream. But at 38 he had given up on the Dream after divorce, remarriage, two children, and various activities had sidetracked him. Professor X's words of belief in and support of him gave Jeff the courage to return to the University. A year later at 39 he attained his Dream.

"I will be her advisor."

Professor Y, 45, enjoyed national recognition in his field. His research, a refinement and an expansion of his dissertation of fifteen years ago, had placed him in a comfortable, prestigious position at the University. For the last three days as a member of his department's selection committee, he had been interviewing students seeking admission to the Ph.D. program. Several applicants expressed their desire to work with Professor Y in his research...
area. Funding and quota restrictions meant that Jennifer, a promising out-of-state applicant in her late 30's would not be accepted unless Professor Y would agree to be her advisor. As she discussed her research interest with the committee, Professor Y felt a certain mental stimulation which he had not had since his own Ph.D. days. Her enthusiasm captivated him, and although her topic was not exactly his, he agreed to be her advisor. And that decision had made all the difference. Since Jennifer became his advisee, Professor Y's own creative endeavors have expanded. Together he and Jennifer have published articles in professional journals. Now four years later Professor Y has married Jennifer.

"What do you want to be when you grow up?"

Professor Z queries Jane. Jane, a doctoral candidate, has just completed her generals and is starting her dissertation. At 32 she is raising her 12-year-old daughter herself, and has been earning an extremely meager salary for the last three years as Professor Z's teaching assistant. Completion of her dissertation will result in her starting in a career that will afford her a standard of living far above the welfare level she has endured for the last three years. Professor Z, as Jane's sponsor, plays an important part in Jane's successful completion of the Dream.

* * * * *

The first two vignettes are based on the researcher's own observations. Only the names and circumstances have been disguised to protect the guilty. The third vignette is a fictionalized composite based on Katz and Hartnett's book (1976). Perhaps
their inclusion seems a bit too sensational for this introduction, but they clearly illustrate the interactive dramas transpiring in such dyadic relationships.

Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain (1982) emphasize that advisors can contribute substantially to the creation of a positive environment for graduate students in the following ways:

1. through positive, non-verbal cues and overt expressions of interest in a student's work and welfare,

2. through open discussions of the developmental issues confronting student and advisor, and

3. through direct programmatic activities designed to create a developmental setting (p. 3).

Katz and Hartnett (1976) also place great emphasis on the quality of graduate student/faculty relations. Wright (1964) found that success on the doctoral level was consistently and often significantly related to social adjustments and integration into the department. Heiss (1970) also indicated that doctoral students evaluate their academic progress more positively the more personalized the orientation of their departments and the greater the opportunities for interaction with their professors.

The Association of Graduate Schools and the Council of Graduate Schools issued the following policy statement concerning the Ph.D. candidate and the dissertation:

The Doctoral of Philosophy degree...has become the mark of highest achievement in preparation for creative scholarship and research. An aspirant or candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy degree conducts research under the guidance and supervision of a member of the graduate faculty
or a committee. As this collaboration proceeds, he gains in experience and ability to conduct independent creative research. When the student completes research which is a significant contribution to knowledge, it is presented in clear and precise English as his dissertation (pp. 1, 10).

The doctoral dissertation serves as the creative capstone for one of the graduate student's first endeavors in creative research. Yet studies (Heiss, 1970; Feldman, 1974; and Riesman, 1976) concerning graduate students working on doctorates consistently report inadequate conditions for promoting creative endeavors.

Katz and Hartnett (1976) summarize their review as follows:

Conditions crucial to the optimal development of productive scholars and scientists are neglected in graduate education. Among these conditions are cultivation of the imaginative capacity, encouragement of cooperative inquiry, discouragement of undue allegiance to a specific 'school of thought,' and security of expectations (p. 262).

In light of such negative evidence, Bargar and Duncan (1982) suggest that advisors can contribute to the creative endeavors of advisees by:

* Comprehending the student and the student's research problem.
* Assuring that the student's endeavor has developmental and creative integrity.
* Sharing 'ownership' of the research problem.
* Maintaining mutual expectations for progress.
* Assisting in the creative research endeavor.
  + Identifying potential resources.
  + Enhancing understanding.
  + Analyzing the problem and the student's relations to it.
  + Synthesizing.
* Critiquing the research endeavor.
* Mentoring (pp. 17-29).
The advisor's role as the graduate candidate's mentor is multifaceted. Both advisor and advisee are interdependent participants in developmental processes which touch personal, as well as professional life. More will be covered on adult developmental issues later. Focus for now will be on the etymology and definitions of the word mentor.

In mythology, Mentor was a valued friend to whom Ulysses entrusted the care of his son Telemachus while the father traveled the world in his ten-year odyssey. Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines a mentor as "a close, trusted, and experienced counselor or guide" (p. 1412). Levinson (1978) explores interrelationships among the developmental issues when he cites the following functions that a mentor may perform:

- He may act as a teacher to enhance the young man's skills and intellectual development. Serving as sponsor, he may use his influence to facilitate the young man's entry and advancement. He may be a host and guide, welcoming the initiate into a new occupational and social world and acquainting him with its values, customs, resources and cast of characters. Through his own virtues, achievements and way of living, the mentor may be an exemplar that the protege can admire and seek to emulate. He may provide counsel and moral support in time of stress. The mentor has another function, and this is developmentally the most crucial one: to support and facilitate the realization of the Dream (p. 98).

Levinson's Dream is described by Bargar and Duncan (1982, p. 30) as serving the function "of supporting and facilitating the student's own self-actualizing efforts." Or as Levinson more abstractly states, "In its primordial form, the Dream is a vague sense of self-in-adult-
world. It has the quality of a vision, an imagined possibility that generates excitement and vitality" (p. 91). The Dream represents the synthesis of values, goals and lifestyle prized by the novice emerging into his "self-in-adult-world."

Levinson studied 40 men--biologists, novelists, executives, and working men. For them the Dream ranged from the myth of the hero to more mundane ends, such as excellent craftsman, the husband-father, the respected member of the community.

Based on the observations of this researcher, it is believed that the successful completion of the dissertation is intrinsically interwoven into the doctoral candidate's Dream. The candidate invests years of intellectual, physical, and emotional energy to attain recognition for his creative endeavor.

The Problem

The nature of advisor-advisee relationships at the doctoral level represents a relatively unstudied phenomenon. Very little exists in the literature which examines the nature of these relationships. Although both professors and graduate students consider such relationships to be of major importance in fostering academic growth, the academic community possesses little information about the interactions that typify such relationships nor the impacts that those interactions have. The following statement, resulting from an extensive study of 127 graduate students studying biochemistry, business, English, law, and psychology in two West Coast and two East Coast universities reinforces these ideas:
...very little attention has been given to the processes by which students become scholars and scientists and the environmental factors which help or hinder these processes....Graduate student relations with members of the faculty are regarded by most graduate students as the most important aspect of the quality of their graduate experience; unfortunately, many also report that it is the single most disappointing aspect of their graduate experience (Hartnett and Katz, 1977, p. 647).

This two-part study was conducted to explore the perspectives of Ph.D. students who participated in this research through their responses to questions in the following categories:

1. ...relationships with others, especially the advisor.

2. ...processes involved in students' doctoral endeavors.

3. ...significant experiences.

This entailed the examination of a number of subsequent questions, such as:

1. How did you select your dissertation topic? Can you explain why it happened this way?

2. What do you recall from working with your advisor that is significant to you? Why was it important? What made it meaningful?

3. What was the role of your advisor in your dissertation experience?

4. How frequent have your contacts been with your advisor? What has been the climate of your relationship? What are the most significant areas of assistance provided by your advisor?

5. Have you been satisfied with the extent of help your advisor has given you? Why? Can you offer any comments that would indicate areas in which you were dissatisfied or areas of particular satisfaction?
6. How has your advisor been of particular assistance in readying material for committee review? In proceeding with the dissertation? In preparing for orals?

7. Did you receive significant help from persons other than your major advisor? What particular help did you receive from members of your reading committee? Did anyone else help in the development of your dissertation? In what manner and to what extent?

8. What do you consider to be your least satisfying experience as a doctoral candidate? Your most satisfying experience?

9. Do you believe your dissertation experience has prepared you for future research? Do you intend to write on topics related to your dissertation? If yes, in either case explain.

10. If you were to start your doctoral work again, what would you do differently?

Part A

The first phase of this study consisted of a survey sent to 214 doctoral candidates and graduates at The Ohio State University in Adult and Vocational-Technical Education, Educational Administration, Educational Foundations and Research, and Student Personnel. One purpose of Part A was to obtain a sampling for Part B of the study. In addition to obtaining a sampling for Part B, this section attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Was your advisor for your dissertation the same or different from the advisor you had for your generals?

2. Approximately how many times did you meet with your advisor in the last six months to discuss your dissertation?

3. How satisfied were you with these meetings?
4. What influence did your advisor have on your dissertation topic selection?

5. What was the nature of your advisor's contribution to your topic selection?

6. How satisfied were you with your advisor's help on your dissertation?

7. What other person(s) was/were helpful for your dissertation progress?

8. How was/were the person(s) helpful?

Part B

The second phase of this study consisted of thirty audiotaped interviews with fifteen men and fifteen women who were selected from the survey conducted in Part A. The major purpose of Part B was to gain more in-depth data concerning the three broad questions enumerated in the problem. The ten subquestions listed on pages 7 and 8 in the statement of the problem were a vehicle for exploring these more general questions.

The literature suggests that differences may exist between the graduate experiences of men and women. In this study the interviews were conducted with convenience samples of fifteen women and fifteen men to help insure that the differences, if any, between the experiences of men and women would be represented in the data.

The researcher wished to study those candidates and graduates who would be working in educational settings with adult clients. Therefore interviewees were chosen from academic programs that met this criterion.
Part B of the study was qualitative in nature. The researcher first sought to let the doctoral candidates and graduates tell their own stories. The methodology also employed the constant comparative method of data analysis. The researcher had certain a priori ideas about the process, but did not seek to test hypotheses or to test theories.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) advocate the qualitative approach because human beings are not segmented, but rather are holistic in their perspectives. They state:

The human being sees few, if any, boundaries to the world of his subjects, except those seen by the subjects themselves. The world is woven of seamless cloth for the naturalistic inquirer; and though he may explore only one portion of the garment at a given time or see it through only one pair of eyes, it nevertheless has the quality of being 'all of a piece.' The world is viewed in holistic fashion, as a continuous context within which program participants view themselves and their lives as real, true, and having meaning (p. 132).

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions are offered for terms used throughout this study:

**Doctoral advisee:** For purposes of this study the term is synonymous with the term doctoral candidate. (The term is synonymous with advisee.)

**Doctoral advisor:** For purposes of this study the term is synonymous with the term mentor. The Ohio State University Graduate School Handbook indicates that a Category III faculty member may
direct master's theses and doctoral dissertations. The Handbook enumerates the qualifications of a Category III faculty member as follows:

1. Education: doctoral degree or appropriate experience.
2. Scholarly and research attainments: evidence of mature, sustained, independent work in scholarly, research or creative activities. Such evidence takes the form of published books, scholarly monographs, articles in refereed or other appropriate journals, presentations, consultantships, or other significant scholarly and professional activity.

**Doctoral candidate:** Graduate student at The Ohio State University who has successfully completed qualifying or general examinations and has been admitted to the final phase, the dissertation, for attaining the Doctoral of Philosophy degree. (Doctoral candidate and advisee are used interchangeably.)

**Doctoral research:** For the purpose of this study, the term doctoral research will be synonymous with the term dissertation research. The Ohio State University Graduate School Handbook defines the dissertation as: "...a scholarly contribution to knowledge in the student's area of specialization. By researching and writing a dissertation, the student is expected to demonstrate a high level of knowledge and the capability to function as an independent scholar" (1981, p. 45).

**Doctor of Philosophy degree:** The highest earned degree awarded by a college or a university. Usually set requirements within a university or college that a graduate student must attain include residency, the number of course work hours completed, the
qualifying or general examination, and dissertation completion. (The term is synonymous with doctorate or Ph.D.)

**Dream:** "Serves the function of supporting and facilitating the student's own self-actualizing efforts" (Bargar and Duncan, 1982, p. 30). This term will apply to "sense of self-in-adult-world" (Levinson, 1978, p. 91).

**Graduate education:** The process of formal education that students pursue after completing the baccalaureate degree.

**Mentor:** For the purpose of this study, the term mentor will be used as it may relate to the role of the doctoral advisor. Levinson's descriptors--teacher sponsor, host, guide, exemplar, counsel, and facilitator of the realization of the Dream--are also part of the dimensions of the term for this study.

**Process:** A system of operations in the production of something; e.g., dissertation.

**Sponsorship:** For the purpose of this study, the term sponsorship will be defined as a doctoral advisor's facilitation of an advisee's own self-actualizing efforts as they relate to the creation of the doctoral dissertation.

**Limitations of the Study**

For purpose of this study, selection of persons for the sample will be limited to doctoral candidates and graduates in the College of Education in selected academic areas of education at The Ohio State University. Conclusions from this population cannot be generalized to other populations.
Content validity of the survey instrument was established by having the questionnaire reviewed by a panel of experts in the field of graduate education. No tests of construct validity were conducted. Additionally, the reliability of the survey instrument was not determined although the survey was administered to a pilot group as a means of evaluating it for clarity, appropriateness, and ease of comprehension.

Significance of the Study

The investigator's interest in this study is rooted in her participation and observations of the dissertation experience, in her experience as an undergraduate advisor, and in her studies in adult development and education. It is intended that this study should extend knowledge concerning the experiences of doctoral candidates and graduates.

...the student at the doctoral level appears to be an unexplored area of study. Development patterns of graduate students have not been identified and studied....Conditions which facilitate the development of graduate students as persons in an academic community must be in proper perspective. Their focus must be directed toward enabling graduate students to achieve their potential (McClure, 1981, p. 7).

The training of the mind is a subtle and complex affair, and one would expect a large body of research and literature to exist in which the intellective and nonintellective factors favoring the development of the mind are explored. Hardly anything of the sort exists (Katz and Hartnett, 1976, p. 3).
Katz and Hartnett (1976) compiled extensive data on research involving graduate students pursuing studies in biochemistry, business, English, law, and psychology. The study of doctoral candidates and graduates in academic fields of education, however, is virtually an unexplored area.

It is hoped that this study will help those persons in academic fields of education--faculty advisors, educational administrators, and counselors--to identify and understand cognitive and social-psychological meanings that graduate students derive from their doctoral experiences. Recommendations for improving graduate programs and advising practices should also result from this study.

Other expected outcomes of the study may include the generation of future research regarding advisor-advisee relationships, the processes involved in the doctoral experience, sex differences in graduate education, and adult development issues, particularly as they relate to graduate education.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter II, a review of literature related to the study, is presented in three sections: (1) Theories and Research in Adult Development, (2) Perspectives of Women in Higher Education, and (3) Graduate Education and Influences of Mentoring and Sponsorship.

Theories and Research in Adult Development

This section consists of two parts. First, is an overview of literature pertaining to how selected personality theorists perceive the characteristics of the ideal adult. Second, studies in adult development stage theory are reviewed.

What does it mean to be an adult? Perhaps it is misleading to search for the correct answer. Rather the best answer may come from looking at a variety of theories which represent different, yet equally valid ways of approaching the study of the adult.

Carl Rogers views the fully functioning person as one who is engaged in the continuous process of actualizing his/her potential. If fully functioning, a person has eliminated incongruity between experience and the self. The following characteristics represent Rogers' ideal adult:
1. They will be open to experience....
2. Their self-structures will be congruent with their experiences and will be capable of changing so as to assimilate new experiences.
3. They will see themselves as the locus of evaluation of their experiences....
4. They will experience unconditional positive self-regard.
5. They will live in maximum harmony with others because of their willingness to give them unconditional positive regard (Hergenhahn, 1980, p. 314).

Maslow studied personal acquaintances, students, and such historical figures as Albert Einstein, Thomas Jefferson, and Eleanor Roosevelt. From his final study of 48 people, he categorized his subjects as probable, partial, potential or possible actualizers. Of the fifteen characteristics self-actualizing people exhibit, Maslow stated that creativity was the one universal characteristic of all those subjects he studied or observed. There were no exceptions.

Scientists have noted that life is dynamic; however, scientific study of the human life cycle is a relatively new phenomenon. Within any segment of a population human development occurs in every age group. One human may, in effect, be many different people in his lifetime. These changes after childhood occur at discernible developmental stages. The stages seem the same for everyone within a culture, and what happens in each stage generally happens to everyone about the same time. This is particularly significant in adults between 25 and 45 years of age.

Stages of development have been studied by many modern psychologists. Rogers (1979) made the following comments concerning
the status of research on adulthood:

The study of adulthood from the developmental point of view is in its infancy, except in the field of gerontology....it is a great deal easier to do research on adolescents and older people because those groups are captive research subjects in schools and rest homes....Looking ahead it is hoped that certain significant deficiencies will be remedied. For one thing, more research should be done regarding the early adult years from about 21 to 35....More studies should also be made of older people who are not institutionalized and who have aged successfully....A second need is to study adults not as a homogeneous grouping, but as subtypes, according to cultures and social class....There should also be replication of research so that policies and programs will not be implemented in terms of studies which lack adequate substantiation....(pp. 27-28).

Further questions relating to stage theory and adult development were posed in other studies:

To what extent, and in what ways, should society promote integration of people of different ages? What are some of the ways in which society should develop policies to assist people at particular stages? What would happen to current life stages if the life span itself should be lengthened? (Rogers, 1980, p. 36).

...are the stages identified age specific or is the concept of stage more metaphorical in nature? Is the progression of stages inevitable or can a particular stage be suppressed or by-passed? Are there sex differences in the pattern of stages? To what extent are developmental patterns culture-bound? (Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain, 1982, p. 1).

Ultimately the question arises as to the practical value of stage theory. For this researcher, stage theory, a psychosociological approach, offers added dimension to the study of human development. Traditional studies in human development have been dichotomized with focus either on psychological or sociological concepts. Stage theory,
on the other hand, offers more opportunity for synthesis since the individual can be perceived as proceeding through developmental stages within a sociocultural framework.

Among contributors of thought on adult stage development, Erikson, Havighurst, Jung, Brothers, Rubin, Sheehy, and Levinson have been of particular interest to this researcher. Their studies are briefly reviewed as follows:

Erikson views life as consisting of eight stages. The first five stages closely parallel the time frame which Freud had for the first five of his psychosexual stages of development. The sequence of the eight stages is genetically determined, is unalterable, and follows what Erikson calls the epigenetic principle which was derived from the growth of organisms in utero (1968, p. 92).

Attention is directed to Stage 7 (Generativity vs. Stagnation) ages 25 to 65. Erikson concluded that crisis is the key to successful development. In Stage 7, success causes care to emerge; failure results in emerging selfishness.

Havighurst (1972) proposed the theory that there are a series of developmental tasks appropriate to various life stages. Successful achievement of the task leads to happiness and to success with later tasks, while failure leads to unhappiness in the individual and difficulty with later tasks. These tasks are summarized below:

**Earlier Adulthood (18-30)**

- Selecting a mate
- Learning to live with the marriage partner
- Beginning a family
- Rearing children
- Managing the home
Embarking on an occupation
Assuming civic responsibility
Finding congenial social groups

Middle Age (30-55)
Achieving adult social and civic responsibility
Establishing and maintaining an appropriate standard
of living
Helping teenage children to become happy, responsible
adults
Developing worthwhile adult leisure activities
Relating adequately to the spouse as a person
Accepting and adapting to physiological changes of
middle age
Adjusting to aging parents

Later Maturity (55-?)
Adjusting to declining physical health and strength
Adapting to the death of a spouse
Adjusting to reduced income and retirement
Establishing relationships with one's age group
Fulfilling civic and social obligations

One particular weakness of Havighurst's theory is that it is
limited to American culture. Another is that some people can omit
some of the steps. For example, some never marry yet live satisfac-
tory lives; some postpone children until their late 30's. Havighurst's
developmental task theory does help place adulthood in perspective and
underscores the concept of the teachable moment.

Jung defined libido as the general life energy that can be
directed to any problem that arises, be it biological or spiritual.
His three stages of development which were defined in terms of the
focus of libidinal energy are as follows:

Childhood (from birth to adolescence). During the
early portion of this period, libidinal energy is
expended on the learning of such things as walking,
talking, and other skills necessary for survival.
After the fifty year, more and more libidinal
energy is directed toward sexual activities and reaches its peak during adolescence.

Young Adulthood (from adolescence to about forty). During this stage libidinal energy is directed toward such things as learning a vocation, getting married, raising children, and relating in some way to community life. During this stage, the individual tends to be outgoing, energetic, impulsive, and passionate.

Middle Age (from about forty to later years of life). This was for Jung the most important stage of development. The person is transformed from an energetic, extroverted, and biologically oriented person to one with more cultural, philosophical, and spiritual values. The person is now much more concerned with wisdom and with life's meaning. The needs that must be satisfied during this stage are just as important as those of the preceding stages, but they are different kinds of needs (Hergenhahn, 1980, pp. 60-61).

Brothers (1981) identifies five developmental stages for the adult male. (The first and third stages are considered the most difficult, as well as the most crucial):

1. Onward and Upward: The tension-ridden years from twenty-one to about thirty-five, the age varying somewhat from man to man, when the male concentrates on establishing himself at work, marrying, and starting a family.

2. Consolidation: The years from about thirty-five to forty or possibly forty-three or forty-four, when he pulls together the accomplishments of the previous period.

3. The Pivotal Decade: It may be from forty to fifty, forty-five to fifty-five, or somewhere in between. It is the time when a man senses the arrival of middle age, and it is characterized by physical and psychological distress. The quality and character of a man's life are largely determined during this stage, hence its description as pivotal.
4. Equilibrium: The years from fifty or fifty-five until retirement. They can be very sweet. But if a man has not solved the problems of the Pivotal Decade, these years will be a bitter reprise of that stage.

5. Retirement: A time of satisfaction and serenity—or resentment, disappointment, and fear. It all depends on how a man emerged from the Pivotal Decade (Brothers, p. 56).

Rubin (1979), who studied issues of a woman's relation to self, husband, family, and work, conducted interviews with 160 women, aged 35 to 54, all of whom were or had been married and had children. For her subjects the end of the active mothering function was greeted with relief, and thus she considered the empty-nest syndrome a myth.

Sheehy (1976) interviewed 115 educated middle-class women between 18 and 55. Her cross-sectional research focused on those subjects who seemed to exemplify the conflicts and attitudes characteristic of each stage. The patterns that follow, says Sheehy, are meant to describe, not prescribe:

Caregiver: A woman who marries in her early twenties or before and who at that time is of no mind to go beyond the domestic role.

Either-Or: Women who feel required in their twenties to choose between love and children or work and accomplishment. There are two types:

Nurturer Who Defers Achievement: She postpones any strenuous career efforts to marry and start a family. But unlike the caregiver, she intends to pick up on an extrafamilial pursuit at a later point.

Achiever Who Defers Nurturing: She postpones motherhood and often marriage, too, in order to spend at least six or seven years completing her professional preparation.
Integrators: Women who try to combine it all in the twenties—to integrate marriage, career, and motherhood.

Never-Married Women: Including paranurturers and office wives.

Transients: Women who choose impermanence in their twenties and wander sexually, occupationally, geographically (pp. 295-296).

Sheehy (1981) conducted another study after obtaining the results of more than 60,000 life history questionnaires distributed through educational institutions, community groups, and magazines. Selected for lengthy interviews were men and women, middle-aged and older, who had managed to adjust old dreams to new realities by overcoming such impairments as failures at work, the loss of love, or serious illnesses.

Pathfinders was Sheehy's terminology for those men and women who had succeeded in meeting the crises of adulthood. She observed that each pathfinder possessed a notable sense of personal well-being, a trait she felt was available to nearly everyone, but that especially distinguished the pathfinders.

Sheehy identified ten elements of this personal well-being, the top three of which were:

(1) My life has meaning and direction.
(2) I have handled one or more important transitions in my adult years...in an unusual, personal, or creative way.
(3) I rarely feel cheated or disappointed by life.

The other seven elements all relate to self-satisfactions and to acceptance of one's role or station in life (pp. 12-18). These ten elements of well-being, Sheehy concluded, formed the foundations
of success in approaching each stage of personal development in adult life.

Levinson (1978) conducted an extensive study of forty men between ages 35 and 45. Each of the men was seen in 1969 and 1970 for a total of ten to twenty hours, over a period of several months. Most were visited again a year or two later. Their wives were also interviewed. Levinson's team then compiled a biography of each. The team also studied the biographies of great men, such as Gandhi, Luther, and Dante, as well as memorable characters from literature. The outcome was that a number of eras in the male cycle were identified. Each of these eras contains a series of growth periods defined by the developmental tasks a person must perform during these periods. Levinson found that the novice phase, which starts at about 17 and lasts some fifteen years, is crucial in determining a man's course in his midlife decade from ages 35 to 45.

Below is an outline of Levinson's eras, cross-era transitions, and developmental periods:

1. CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE 0-22
   Early Childhood Transition 0-3
2. EARLY ADULTHOOD 17-45
   Early Adult Transition 17-22
   *Entering the adult world 22-28
   *Age 30 transition
   *Settling down 33-40
3. MIDDLE ADULTHOOD 40-65
   Mid-life Transition 40-45
   *Entering middle adulthood 45-50
   *Age 50 transition
   *Culmination of middle adulthood 55-60
4. LATE ADULTHOOD 60-?
   Late Adult Transition 60-65
Levinson (1978) is particularly relevant in this study because he pays attention to the significant influence that the mentor has on the novice emerging into his "self-in-adult-world." Although to mentor can mean to serve as teacher, sponsor, host and guide, exemplar, and counsel; Levinson considers the most important function of the mentor is that he facilitates the realization of the Dream (p. 98).

Summary

"Theories and Research in Adult Development" was the first section in the review of the literature. The researcher first focused on the question, "What does it mean to be an adult?" Rogers and Maslow, two personality theorists, supplied paradigms identifying their "ideal" or "self-actualized" adults. Next the researcher very briefly reviewed adult development stage theories formulated by Erikson, Havighurst, Jung, Brothers, Rubin, Sheehy, and Levinson. Sheehy and Levinson are most pertinent for this study because both have landmark books that address the subject of adults in mid-life transition. Sheehy (1976) focuses on women; Levinson (1978), on men in mid-life transition. Levinson is also extremely pertinent for this study because he pays attention to mentoring and the Dream.

Perspectives on Women in Higher Education

Women in academia have reported many attitudes and experiences which indicate they were not, in fact, always treated as equals, and that they did seem to encounter obstacles to their success often related to the mere fact they were not male. The following
quotation from a determined graduate student illustrates an obstacle not uncommon in the mid-50's:

"Miss Bauer, I asked you to come here because I think I owe it to you to discourage you from coming to Columbia. You had the highest qualifying examinations of any applicant. And you were an excellent student, it seems [three honor societies], at Cornell. So we would not refuse you. But we would like you to know that we feel you are standing in the way of some man who can really use this education....We think it would be far better if you would cede your place to a man who will make psychology his lifetime career...."

"I understand the point you are making, but I want to be a psychologist. Columbia offers the best training that can be obtained and I'm enormously pleased that I have been accepted. This is what I want and this is what I am going to do. I promise you that I will do as good a job as any man."

"If this is your decision, I respect it. But I want you to know that we will make life very difficult for you" (Brothers, 1981, pp. 14-16).

For the next six years of graduate study, Miss Bauer's life was made difficult in unnecessary ways. Because Columbia's psychology department was "practically 99.9 percent pure male," she had to convince each new professor in each new course that she was serious and could do the work.

Miss Bauer, now Dr. Joyce Brothers, named one of the ten most influential American women in a United Press International poll, states that such an incident which she encountered in the 50's could not happen today--not at least, in the same blatant way.

Studies by Roby (1972), Feldman (1974), Katz and Hartnett (1976), Solomon (1976), and Tittle and Denker (1980) indicate that
there is a great deal of inequality based on sex at the graduate level. But this is not surprising since historically inequalities have existed between men and women in higher education. [See McClure's 1981 study for an extensive review of research on the history of doctoral programs.]

Structural obstacles which hinder female students in their efforts to obtain a doctorate include quotas and selective admissions policies, denial of fellowships because they are part-time students who have family responsibilities, lack of role models to influence their professional identity, faculty attitudes based on sex stereotypes which take the form of lesser expectations of women in terms of career aspirations and job placement efforts.

Situational obstacles revolve around conflicts of personal and professional life. Especially pertinent are problems married women have with time management. Women graduates frequently spend more time on domestic and personal tasks than men. Adler (1976) found that women had less time for research and study because much of their time involved housework, shopping, commuting, personal care, and child care.

Katz (1976) and Rubin (1979) found that husbands who were strongly supportive of their wives returning to school still showed either overt or covert ambivalence. Even worse psychological conflicts were described by Tittle and Denker.

Both husbands and children may resent less than full attention from a wife as she returns to school....When a woman's achievements in returning detract or interfere with family
needs or their accustomed way of life, resistance may be expressed in a variety of ways. Husbands and children may make demands for activities that they had previously ignored—such as going to movies, going out to eat, going shopping; but women may not have time for these activities and for meeting the demand of their role as students. The reality of power relationship between husband and wife may be expressed directly, in threats of withdrawal of financial support or divorce. Doing household tasks may become a major issue within the family (p. 45).

For the woman in her twenties or early thirties who typically has children aged 12 or under, the roles of student, homemaker, and mother may prove intolerable. The time alone required for each role may be cause for such women to withdraw from graduate studies. Guilt concerning the appropriate amount of time to be devoted to child care is another obstacle (Tittle and Denker, 1980, pp. 46-47).

The older, more mature woman pursuing a Ph.D. is a special case. The researcher has observed several such students who have older children and who have supported a husband, often now a professional, through graduate school. For this woman student, usually aged 35 to 45, her psychological obstacles are intensified since she has a problem of arrested vocational role identity. Tittle and Denker (1980) address this problem:

For a woman, the struggle for independence from her family is replaced in adulthood. Women often move from a dependent status within the family to a dependent status within their marriage. Phyllis Katz (1979) has described the struggle for independence from another perspective—-that of the development of sex roles: learning the appropriate child sex role behaviors; preparation for adult sex roles (early and late adolescence); and development of adult sex roles. The vocational role for women is not clearly established by ages 20 to 35, or, typically, is delayed in
level of career commitment. It may not be until middle adulthood that the vocational interest area becomes fully developed and self-identity is completed (p. 44).

Bem and Bem (1976) discuss the power of a nonconscious ideology, obscured by an equalitarian veneer; namely, individuals are unaware of it because alternative beliefs and attitudes about women go unrecognized. Their analogy is, "We are like the fish who is unaware that his environment is wet. After all, what else could it be?" (p. 180). They further describe what "liberal" society today would consider a "utopian" marriage of equality which they cite as a hypothetical example:

Both my wife and I earned Ph.D. degrees in our respective disciplines. I turned down a superior academic post in Oregon and accepted a slightly less desirable position in New York where my wife could obtain a part-time teaching job and do research at one of the several other colleges in the area. Although I would have preferred to live in a suburb, we purchased a home near my wife's college so that she could have an office at home where she would be when the children returned from school. Because my wife earns a good salary, she can easily afford to pay a maid to do her major household chores. My wife and I share all other tasks around the house equally. For example, she cooks the meals, but I do the laundry for her and help her with many of her other household tasks (p. 188).

Bem and Bem also pose the interesting question as to whether the "utopian" marriage described above is actually such. The test? Reverse the roles of the husband and wife and see if the same tone is retained. Their conclusion follows:

It is a mark of how well the woman has been kept in her place that the husband in such a marriage is often idolized by women, including
his wife, for 'permitting' her to squeeze a career into the interstices of their marriage as long as his own career is not unduly inconvenienced. Thus is the white man blessed for exercising his power benignly while his 'natural' right to that power forever remains unquestioned.... Such is the subtlety of a non-conscious ideology! (p. 189)

The problem with trying to discuss situational and structural obstacles that women face as graduates is that actually these obstacles cut into and overlap with problems women face concerning the fact that they are different from men and are socialized differentially. Feldman (1974) identifies some of the literature treating women in academia as follows:

Women are different physiologically and temperamentally and are socialized differentially than men. These differences handicap women when they attempt to compete with men (p. 12).

Several studies address the question of whether men and women differ in their perceived cognitive abilities and skills. Maccoby and Jacklin (1976) found no evidence of a sex difference in analytic ability, but did find males to be superior in visual/spatial abilities. They also found evidence that females are superior in verbal ability and males are superior in mathematical ability.

What does it mean to be female? Basically there are stereotypical definitions of what it means to be female. A female should be nurturant and care for children. A female's sphere of influence should be in the home. She should be less aggressive, as contrasted with the dominant and assertive male. She should defer to the male in matters of intellect.
Kagan (1971) adds to the empirical research of the continuing existence of sex-role stereotypes, despite apparent trends toward unisex:

feminine sex role standards...emphasize the ability to experience deep feelings, to gratify love objects, and to elicit sexual arousal in a male, while masculine standards emphasize the ability to gratify a love object...to be pragmatic, independent in judgment, and the ability to control expression of fear (p. 19).

Interpretations of research studies involving sex-role stereotyping have a number of problems. Hoyenga and Hoyenga (1979) indicate that even the gender of the experimenter may give different results to outcomes of the test. For example, in one experiment both sexes did better with a same-sex tester (p. 254).

Hoyenga and Hoyenga also cite the Rosenthal Effect, or the self-fulfilling prophecy, which may strongly affect the investigator's research design, as well as other critical aspects of his/her study, such as the interpretation of data. They offer the following advice:

Beliefs about sex differences in behavior not only determine childrearing practices but also easily color the interpretation of data, the selection of subjects, and even the direction of experimental results. These beliefs can be self-fulfilling; if they are held strongly the data will be likely to support them, making them even stronger. So no great confidence should be placed in data that has not been replicated by experimenters with different points of view and that has not been supported by a variety of data across several different experimental areas. Otherwise, the answer to the question of why there are differences
between the sexes might simply be, 'because of experimenter bias' (p. 20).

Another problem with empirical studies may lie in the design of the test construct. Traditional testing of personality differences between males and females has followed lines of crude conceptualization. Test items for femininity and for masculinity have been often designed for typological categorization. Thus an individual is placed in one or the other categories, male or female, and is then expected to display all the personality characteristics expected of that sex. Such a model ignores variability from one individual to the next, not to mention the overlap in distributions for the two sexes; that is, sex similarities.

The bipolar continuum views maleness and femaleness on a continuous scale. Hoyenga and Hoyenga question whether these tests adequately "...reflect the changing nature of masculinity and femininity throughout the course of development" (p. 57).

Another model is the two-dimension scheme. This model views masculinity and femininity on two different dimensions; thus an individual may be both very masculine and very feminine.

The multidimensional scheme, developed by Bem in 1974, incorporates the measurement for androgyny. In this construct an individual can have both masculine and feminine components in his or her personality. Bem (1974) has found that the individual with both strong masculine and strong feminine characteristics is most capable of adapting to a variety of situations.
Notwithstanding acknowledged differences between males and females, the researcher will focus for the balance of this portion of this study on other issues, such as career development of successful female executives, including the Queen Bee Syndrome, and characteristics of creative women.

Hennig and Jardim's study of 25 high-level female executives noted the following characteristics common to their subject:

1. Their mothers tend to be 'care givers' rather than career-oriented women.
2. Early identification was with the father rather than with the mother.
3. The father relationship was very special in that their femininity was not rejected nor were they treated as boys. Unlike a son, the daughter never became the father's rival. Nor did she feel it was necessary to compete with her mother for the father's attention.
4. They delayed motherhood and children in favor of a career. Most remained with the same firm for many years until they got a high level position.
5. Their mentor was their boss who in effect took over a father's role.
6. They remained dependent on their mentors until they reached mid-management and the age of 35 (Bolton, 1980, p. 203).

Phillips (1977) studied 331 women managers and executives who participated in a national survey. Follow-up interviews were conducted in New York City and Los Angeles with 60 of the survey respondents. Most of those women in the study have had Double Track career patterns; namely, they have combined full-time employment with marriage, family, and homemaking responsibilities. Phillips designated five factors which contributed to the women's psychological development:
Being competent.
Having strong drive and determination.
Gaining knowledge in school and other courses.
Having good personalities.
Being sponsored or groomed by another person.

The women managers' and executives' adult lives seemed to fall into seven psychological-development stages:

- Leaving the Family (18-22 years)
- Reaching Out (23-28)
- Questions, Questions (29-34)
- Mid-Life Push (35-44)
- Renewal vs Resignation (45-54)
- Reexamination (55-64)
- Integrity (65 years and beyond)

The women in Phillips' study were involved with four career stages, all of which related to the different roles they performed throughout their professional lives. Those four career stages were enumerated as follows: Stage I: Apprentice; Stage II: Individual Contributor; Stage III: Mentor; and Stage IV: Policy Influencer.

Asked to name the most influential persons in terms of their career development, the women mentioned male bosses, husbands, and both parents.

On the questionnaire survey, 61 percent of the women stated they had had one or more career mentors during their lifetime. These mentors were identified as primary and secondary.

Phillips also notes the following:

Not every attempted mentoring experience is a successful one for the mentor, protege, or both. Several factors contribute to the success or failure of a mentoring experience, which consists of three dimensions: the mentoring relationship (the participants' attitudes toward themselves, each other, and the experience,
their needs and personal characteristics, the length of the relationship, and the participants' reasons for and control over participating), the mentoring help (appropriateness and potential impact), and the timing of the experience (when it occurs within each participant's career stages and within the external environment). All three dimensions must be present for the effect to be a positive one for both mentor and protege. If one dimension is weak or off (such as timing), an extra burden is placed upon the other dimension to compensate (pp. 6414A-6415A).

The Queen Bee syndrome, formulated by Staines et al. (1974), and emphasized by Hyde and Rosenberg (1976) is a phenomenon characteristic of some highly successful professional women. These women, the "Uncle Toms" of the women's movement, try to keep other women "down," even though they are in a position to advance the women's cause. Because of the Queen Bee's belief in individual determinants of success, she rejects networking and fostering a mentor relationship with women in subordinate positions. Her status is summarized as follows:

In the context of the psychology of women, the Queen Bee syndrome is distressing yet not too surprising. Certainly it can at least in part be traced to the femininity-achievement double-bind. The Queen Bee has found one means for resolving this bind--or perhaps her solution represents no resolution at all (p. 99).

Helson (1971) studied characteristic traits of creative women mathematicians which were listed as:

Rebellious independence.
Narcissism.
Introversion.
Rejection of outside influence.
Strong symbolic interests.
Marked ability to find self-expression and self-gratification in directed research activity. Flexibility, or lack of constriction, both in general attitudes and in mathematical work.

Lest these women seem unduly bizarre, Helson noted that these traits have all been ascribed to the creative person, whether male or female.

Helson (1971) also looked into the personality development of creative women mathematicians. Hyde and Rosenberg (1976) report her findings as follows:

...she found evidence of ambivalence toward their mothers, and modeling after fathers. It seems, then, that in many cases creative women have identified with their fathers, who have often used intellectual activity for expression in life. However, it is important to note that this same pattern also appears among creative men, who in many cases identified more with their mothers. The biographical correlates of both creative men and creative women are similar in that they both show frequent reversed sex-role models (p. 98).

Anastasi and Schaefer (1969) took biographical inventories of unusually creative girls. The parents of these subjects had higher socio-economic status and the fathers were more educated than average. The subjects shared in common the following characteristics: imaginative daydreams, eidetic imagery (extremely vivid mental images), unusual collections (such as ant pictures), and imaginary childhood companions (Hyde and Rosenberg, 1976, p. 99).

Interpersonal obstacles faced by women in graduate schools are addressed by several studies.
Simon, et al. (1967) presents a profile on the woman Ph.D. According to this survey, the idea that women are less productive than their male colleagues is without support. Simon found that 96 percent of the unmarried women and 87 percent of the married women with no children work full time. The mean number of articles published was 5.3 for married women, 4.1 for unmarried women, and 5.2 for men. Only 50 percent of the women were married, as opposed to a marriage rate of about 90 percent for men. Of particular relevance is the end of the article which discusses lack of informal channels:

...We suggest that the 'problem' which bothers the woman Ph.D. who is a full time contributor to her profession is that she is denied many of the informal signs of belonging and recognition. These women report that even on such simple daily activities as finding someone to have lunch or take a coffee break with or finding someone with whom she can chew over an idea, or on larger issues such as finding a partner with whom she can share a research interest, the woman Ph.D. has a special and lower status. Perhaps, then, it is in matters such as these that she has achieved less than full membership in the 'club,' and she is left with a feeling that she belongs to a minority group which has not gained full acceptance (p. 236).

Feldman (1974) reports that women graduate students face problems related to their sex. Female graduate students were less likely to have published or to be involved in research and less likely to have a close relationship with a professor. However, in those instances when a female graduate student was allowed to develop a close working relationship with a professor, she was active within and committed to her profession.
Kjerulff and Blood (1973) add an additional dimension to the status of women in graduate school:

Graduate school is a period in which the student develops a professional identity and commitment to behave as a member of a particular occupation. Two important mechanisms in this process are interaction with peers and professors. Studies of women graduate students and women Ph.D.s in the labor market indicate the women in both settings have patterns of limited communication with those who could be of help to them in terms of acquiring research information and encouragement to stay in the profession. Women graduate students tend on the average to do less research while in graduate school than their male peers, and are less likely to receive the Ph.D. (p. 626).

Kjerulff and Blood concluded their study of communication patterns in male and female graduate students in a department of psychology with these observations concerning major differences:

The more the male graduate student perceived his relationship with his research advisor as interesting the more discussions he had with him outside of the office context. There was no relationship between these two variables for women graduate students, indicating that women are less free to pursue an interesting relationship with a professor outside of the office context than men are.

By not being able to interact with professors outside of the office context as their male peers do, female graduate students miss out on a type of informal communication which could be helpful both in terms of acquiring research information, and developing feelings of belonging in the field and acceptance as a colleague.

Women graduate students tended more than men to discuss their research interests with other graduate students (p. 630).
Cameron and Blackburn (1981) studied sponsorship and academic career success. "The only case where sex difference enters is in network involvement. Here males have established a significantly larger number of associations than females" (p. 374).

What makes a high achiever?

Charles Garfield, head of the Peak Performance Center in Berkeley, has studied 1500 achievers in varied careers. Based on Garfield's research the following seven steps are listed and annotated:

1. **Lead a well-rounded life.** High performers are willing to work hard but within strict limits; for them, work is not everything.

2. **Select a career you care about.** High performers want internal satisfaction, not just external rewards such as raises, promotion and power.

3. **Rehearse each challenging task mentally.** Before any difficult or important situation most peak performers run through their desired actions in their minds over and over (deliberate mental workout that hones the skills actually used in the activity).

4. **Seek results, not perfection.** High performers don't think of their mistakes as failures. Instead, they learn from them so they can do better the next time.

5. **Be willing to risk.** Constructing a 'worse case scenario' allows making a rational choice. If immobilized by fear [you] have no choice at all.

6. **Don't underestimate your potential.** High performers concentrate on themselves--on their feelings, on their functioning, on the momentum of their effort--and are therefore freer to achieve at peak level.

7. **Compete with yourself, not with others.** Because most high performers are interested in doing
the best possible job by their own standards, they tend to be 'team players' rather than loners (Hunt, 1982, pp. 85-88).

Because time management and multiple role demands are so crucial to professional achievement by women, this researcher endorses a step advocated by the famous and very successful Mary Kay Ash, founder and chief executive of Mary Kay Cosmetics: Hire a housekeeper. In her autobiography, Mary Kay (1981), she relates the importance a housekeeper played in freeing her of time-consuming tasks which could be appropriately delegated to enable her to focus on professional responsibilities.

It moreover seems appropriate to end this section with a philosophy that Dr. Joyce Brothers (1981) advocates for dealing with strained male-female relationships:

We have come a long way, both men and women. But there are strains. And they seem to be intensifying. And they are not confined to the heads of university departments and determined female students. They exist on every level...If women want to, they can ameliorate these strains--and without sacrificing any of the gains they have achieved. In a way, it is like being your own Secretary of State. If you are going to negotiate with another power, even a beloved power, for rights, privileges, and concessions...you must understand what those rights, privileges, and concessions mean to the other fellow. Information is the secret weapon of diplomacy (pp. 16-17).

Summary

Studies indicated that, at the least, experiences of women are different from those of men; at the most, women may experience a great deal of inequality at the graduate level. Sex-role
stereotyping was reviewed and structural and situational obstacles were cited. On a more positive note, studies were reviewed that revealed creative, successful, and professional women. Finally positive approaches were suggested for dealing with certain problems which women encounter.

Graduate Education and Influences of Mentoring and Sponsorship

...over half of all full-time faculty members have never written or edited any sort of book alone or in collaboration with others....more than one-third have never published an article ....half of the professionals have not published anything, or had anything accepted for publication, in the last two years....more than one quarter of all full-time academics have never published a scholarly word....in all, about one-fourth of the academics have published extensively--which we have construed as 10 or more articles or three or more monographs. Half either don't publish at all, or manage only two or three items over their careers. The remaining fourth fall into the 'moderate' range of publications (Spriestersbach and Henry, 1978, p. 53).

The above quotation is based on a nationwide survey of faculty members in American colleges and universities. According to the 1975 survey, Spriestersbach and Henry pose this question: "How culpable...is the dissertation experience in effecting this ironic result?" (p. 53).

Both Heiss and Packer conclude that present Ph.D. programs require pedantic over-specialization: "...the weakness in most Ph.D. programs seems to center on the fact that while the program professes to educate for research, in reality it trains for it" (Heiss, 1970,
The young (or middle-aged) Ph.D. is crippled by this pedantry when he joins a faculty. He is wedded to his dissertation subject as a field for him to write about and, hence, to teach. He is subjected to false pressure to stick to this narrow field of scholarly interest. He consequently learns more and more about less and less. The easy route to achieving tenure is to re-do his dissertation as a book. The pressure of this easy route inhibits the young faculty member's capacity to take chances, and it also impairs his imagination (Packer, 1970, p. 53).

In contrast to Packer's "easy route," Riesman (1976) prescribes the "higher road":

...graduate students should be encouraged to regard the dissertation as an exercise in professional craftsmanship that will allow them to display their full originality when they rewrite and expand it for publication (p. 12).

Despite Riesman's more positive comments above, he finds the dissertation experience also to be alienating:

...graduate schools themselves often turn students against research. An undergraduate student who comes from a small liberal arts college of extremely high quality where faculty bring undergraduates into their research may find a major research university, in contrast, to be an alienating experience. Students and faculty alike may debunk the work of their colleagues and predecessors, thus setting impossibly high standards, and the longer one waits to finish one's dissertation, the more one feels it has to be a work of genius to justify the delay (p. 12).

The purpose of a thesis in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was quite different than it is today. Spriestersbach and Henry (1978) relate that in those centuries, "thesis" involved
a public ceremony, examination, or both. American dissertation requirements today evolve from the German model inspired by Helmholtz who professed that "...every student should add at least one brick to the evergrowing temple of knowledge" (pp. 52-53).

McClure (1981) discusses the doctoral concept:

'[...][which] was introduced into the United States early in the nineteenth century by Americans who studied in Germany and returned to teaching posts in our major Eastern universities.' There were few places other than the German university to go for advanced work and '...few opportunities at this time for the advanced student who wanted to specialize in some phase of the arts and sciences.' These professors brought the concept of academic freedom back to the United States and it '...contained two major aspects: Lernfreiheit, or the freedom of the student to choose his own studies in an elective system, and Lehrfreiheit, the freedom of the professor to investigate and teach the results of his researches without governmental interference.' Research was a part of the foundation and orientation of the United States graduate program for '...the German university spirit of search for knowledge and its concomitant emphasis on productive research were transplanted in large measure to America.' The generation of new knowledge rather than the transmission of knowledge was the graduate's school purpose. As a result of the German influence, 'the graduate school was to be oriented primarily toward research rather than toward teaching, as the college had been traditionally' (pp. 21-22).

Spriestersbach and Henry (1978) issued a call for university accountability to establish valid guidelines for evaluation and reforms for graduate training and performance:
1. Let's for once and for all bury the notion that the dissertation must represent a significant contribution to knowledge.

2. Let's think seriously about what we must do to validate the place of the research experience in our various degree programs.

3. To the extent that we retain the formal dissertation requirement, let's do more than give lip service to the importance of the adviser.

4. We must be sure to take the differences among disciplines duly into account when we plan the education of our students for research and the critical review of existing materials in their fields.

5. Finally, let us cultivate...rationality in our design of graduate programs....If we really intend to prepare Ph.D. graduates for scholarly careers, and if most scholarly publication takes the form of articles, then it is important to ask ourselves why Ph.D. graduates should be required to start their careers by producing book length dissertations (pp. 54-55).

Spriestersbach and Henry, it should be noted, stress in point four of their proposal the need to recognize the key role that the advisor plays. Bargar and Duncan (1982) and Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain (1982) give further support for this concept and outline key elements which should exist for quality advising to take place. Those authors emphasize that the advisor is best able to help the advisee raise issues concerning the intrinsic interest and value of the student's chosen area of study, generate insightful syntheses and propositions concerning his professional studies, offer direct criticism and supplemental resources, and stimulate and reinforce the student's creative ability.
The purpose of the remainder of this review is to explore the socialization process in the career development of the graduate student. Focus will be set on the advisor's role as a mentor.

The socialization process is complex. It includes numerous psychological, social, and individual variables which interact. Other variables include individual perceptions, cognitive ability, economic factors, work and marital status, homemaking or childcare responsibilities, and the presence of role models and mentors. This complex socialization process begins to mold the child during infancy and continues throughout adolescence and adulthood.

Bandura (1973) offers three reasons why modeling is significant for learning in daily life:

1. Models demonstrate how required activities are to be performed.

2. Modeling provides a faster way of learning than that of direct experience.

3. Some complex behavior can be produced only through the influence of models (p. 197).

Bargar and Duncan (1982) indicate that role modeling is "a fundamental means" for advisors to educate the doctoral student. The following statement articulates their belief that dissertation writing can foster creativity when the faculty member is both an adroit advisor and a role model:

Demonstrating the vital dimensions of creative endeavor through creative scholarship and research or insightful advising may teach students more about creativity than could ever be conveyed through abstract explanation (p. 25).
Almquist and Angrist (1971) in their study of career aspirations among college women note the influence of a role-model reference group framework. The most significant difference found between the career women and the non-career women was that career women were influenced by faculty members and occupational role models in choosing an occupation. The non-career women, on the other hand, were influenced by family members in pursuing an occupation, and tended to identify with a compatible male about their own age.

Within the context of social learning and the discussion of modeling influences on career development, the literature in the 50's and 60's predominantly referred to "reference groups." Typical of this era is a paper by Kemper (1968) titled, "Reference Groups, Socialization and Achievement." His paper referenced normative groups through which the subject was expected to comply with norms and values set by a legitimator group.

Morris Stein (1962) used a different term, "intermediaries," in his paper, "Creativity as an Intra- and Inter-personal Process." His reasoning, though lengthy, is well worth reviewing here. It is interesting to note that the concept referred to other studies already made in the 50's. His concepts, with their cumbersome terminologies, closely parallel the contemporary concept of mentor or sponsor:

In a complex society there are groups of 'intermediaries' who stand between
the creative individual and the broader society. The intermediaries consist of members of scientific and professional organizations....

They play critical roles in the creative process as I have conceived of it here. On the other hand, they provide the creative individual with a studied evaluation of the work from which he might profit....

By accepting the product and by regarding it as creative the group indicates that it accepts and implicitly approves of the needs which initially motivated the creative person to deviate from accepted patterns and to probe the unknown....

For the group the creative product has fulfilled or given expression to certain needs. The creative product 'says' things that the group has wanted to say but has been unable to. The creative product may also give new direction to the experience and behavior of the group (pp. 90-91).

The term "mentor" was not a descriptor in the ERIC documentation file until 1979. This usage seems to have gained prominence since the publication (1978) of Levinson's The Seasons of a Man's Life. Today the term appears frequently in psychology; sociology; vocational, career and adult education; business education and administration; and women's studies.

Bolton (1980) introduces a model which Dalton, Thompson and Price have devised in the context of adult development. During the life work of an individual four career stages are
identified:

Apprentice -- Employee works under close supervision of a more experienced person.

Colleague -- Employee becomes a specialist in his or her field or profession, but relies less on mentor for guidance.

Mentor -- Employee instills confidence and helps junior employees gain competence.

Sponsor -- Employee serves as a manager, entrepreneur or idea innovator (pp. 199-200).

Because mentoring and sponsoring relationships are considered important and significant, certain publications in the literature relate to problems that certain groups of women face:

1. The absence of female role models has an inhibiting effect on the advancement of women (Masicano, 1981; Moore and Sangaria, 1979).

2. Females rarely provide a mentor or sponsor relationship for other women (LaFrance, 1982; Staines et al., 1974).

3. The potential sex aspect of the male-female mentor or sponsor relationship keeps many men from becoming mentors or sponsors to talented women (Bolton, 1982; Woodlands Group, 1980).

4. Women are excluded from the informal structures of organizations (Simon Clark, and Galway, 1967).

Much of the literature concerning graduate student satisfaction supports the idea that faculty relationships with students is the most significant factor contributing to student satisfaction. Hartnett and Katz (1977), who compiled extensive data from research studies which focused on graduate education, serve as the best support for the faculty-student relationship and its contribution to student satisfaction. They state: "Graduate student relations with members of the faculty are regarded by most graduate students
as the most important aspect of the quality of their graduate school experience..." (p. 647).

Gregg (1973) studied several factors affecting graduate student academic and non-academic satisfaction. His conclusion, enumerated as follows, most assuredly supports the preceding statement by Hartnett and Katz:

> Regardless of which control variable was used, collegiality of faculty-student relationships was consistently found to be an effective predictor of both types of satisfaction (p. 497).

Gregg defined collegiality as "...the extent to which the respondent perceives the relationships between faculty members and graduate students in his department to be of a collegial nature" (p. 487). He classified faculty relationships as taking the form of teacher-pupil, master-apprentice, employer-employee, master-slave, or colleague-colleague. He further indicated:

> These various role-relationship types probably are not mutually exclusive categories in that any given role relationship may contain elements of several different types. Thus, an attempt to characterize faculty-student role relationships in any given graduate department may be more of a question of which type, if any, predominates (p. 485).

Another variable, besides collegiality, that Gregg studied was expectation-reality discrepancy or ERD. This was the difference between what the student says he/she expected to encounter in graduate school when he/she entered, and what he/she perceives to be the reality which he/she has experienced. Also worth noting are his findings concerning differences in perception between males and
...for females there is no correlation between either type of satisfaction [academic and non-academic] and ERD, whereas for males the correlation, while not huge, is statistically significant at the .005 level. Thus, sex appears to have a considerable effect on the association between ERD and satisfaction. One possible explanation of this could be that females enter graduate school with less definite or clear-cut expectations for graduate school than do males, and, therefore, the impact would be less for females. Certainly more research needs to be done on the operation of the sex factor in graduate education (p. 498).

The quality of the relationship between advisor and advisee, as previously indicated, is particularly important for graduate student satisfaction. Both advisor and advisee are interdependent participants in developmental processes which touch personal, as well as professional life. Levinson (1978), also previously cited, viewed the mentor relationship as inter-related to a number of roles: teacher, sponsor, host and guide, counsel, exemplar, and most important, facilitator of the Dream (p. 98).

To further reiterate, Bargar and Duncan (1982) suggest that advisors can contribute to creative endeavors of advisees by:

* Comprehending the student and the student's research problem.
* Assuring that the student's endeavor has developmental and creative integrity.
* Sharing 'ownership' of the research problem.
* Maintaining mutual expectations for progress.
* Assisting in the creative research endeavor.
  + Identifying potential resources.
  + Enhancing understanding.
  + Analyzing the problem and the student's relations to it.
  + Synthesizing.
*Critiquing the research endeavor.
*Mentoring (pp. 17-29).

Carl Rogers offers guidelines for fostering interactive growth in a dyadic relationship. His chapter entitled, "A Helping Relationship," is summarized as follows:

1. Can I be in some way which will be perceived by the other person as trustworthy, as dependable or consistent in some deep sense?

2. Can I be expressive enough as a person that what I am will be communicated unambiguously?

3. Can I let myself experience positive attitudes toward that other person--attitudes of warmth, caring, liking, interest, respect?

4. Can I be a sturdy respecter of my own feelings, my own needs, as well as his?

5. Can I give him the freedom to be?

6. Can I step into his private world so completely that I lose all desire to evaluate or judge it?

7. Can I receive him as he is?

8. Can I act with sufficient sensitivity in the relationship that my behavior will not be perceived as a threat?

9. Can I free him from the threat of external evaluations?

10. Can I meet this other individual as a person who is in the process of becoming, or will I be bound by his past and by my past? (1968, pp. 298-303)

To be an adroit advisor and an insightful mentor encompasses many complex interpersonal and professional skills. On the one hand, there are certain prosaic procedural and theoretical precepts to follow in working with the advisee on the dissertation; on the other
hand, the creative endeavor in itself should offer a balance—an opportunity for the emerging scholar to experience, as Hartnett and Katz (1977) indicate, "...intrinsic playfulness and imaginative-ness of the mind" (p. 663).

Bargar and Duncan (1982) relate the quintessence of the relationship:

A wholesome mentoring relationship is one of the most complex, constructive, and mutually rewarding of the cross-age relationships in our troubled society. It is within this broader framework, suggested by the concept of a wholesome mentoring relationship, that we have made our suggestions for advising Ph.D. students during their creative research endeavors (p. 30).

**Summary**

The third section of the review of the literature included an historical overview of the doctorate, guidelines for evaluation and reforms for graduate training and performance, and the socialization process in the career development of the graduate student. Focus in the socialization process was on the advisor's role as a mentor.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a discussion of the methodology used in conducting the two-part investigation. Part A and Part B of the study will be discussed separately.

Part A

Instrumentation. The main purpose of Part A, the survey questionnaire, was to obtain a sampling for Part B of the study. The survey identified selected personal characteristics of the population, the present stage of the dissertation effort, student perceptions of the role of the advisor in the dissertation topic selection, the interpersonal climate between the advisor and advisee, and the degree of advisee satisfaction with the advisor.

Multiple-choice, single-response, scaled-choice, and open-ended questions were included in the fifteen-item "Questionnaire for Ph.D. Candidates and Graduates."

The doctoral committee members, experts in the field of graduate education, reviewed the survey for correct wording, technical order, and appropriate style. A group of doctoral students critiqued the questionnaire survey for clarity, appropriateness, and ease of completion. The questionnaire was appropriately revised.
The resulting questionnaire was subsequently submitted to the researcher's doctoral committee for final approval. Upon the advice of the committee, some questions were modified in accordance with the objectives of the study.

Population. The population included students from the academic areas of Adult and Vocational-Technical Education, Educational Administration, Educational Foundations and Research, and Student Personnel. The researcher believed these areas in the College contained a sampling of candidates and graduates whom Levinson (1978) would consider representative of adult developmental stages encompassing ages 30-transition to 40-midlife transition.

A further consideration was that the researcher wished to study those candidates and graduates who would be working in educational settings with adult clients. Therefore, participants were chosen from the aforementioned academic programs that met this criterion.

The literature suggests that differences may exist between the graduate experiences of men and women. In this study the interviews were conducted with convenience samples of fifteen women and fifteen men to help insure that the differences, if any, between the experiences of men and women would be represented in the data.

To implement Part A of the study, the researcher needed names and addresses of Ph.D. candidates who had completed their generals within the past three years and graduates who had received Ph.D.'s in the past two years in the previously mentioned academic areas in the College of Education. Dr. Fred J. Schmieder, administrator
in the College of Education, met with the researcher in October, 1982. He indicated that in order for the researcher to obtain authorization to collect the names and addresses of prospective participants in the study, a formal request should be sent to Dr. R. Mikell O'Donnell, assistant dean in the College of Education.

Following Dr. Schmieder's suggestion, the researcher sent Dr. O'Donnell a letter that included: (1) intent of the researcher, (2) permission of the advisor, (3) willingness of the researcher to assume computer-time expenses and any other costs for obtaining the needed information, and (4) acceptance of the study by the Behavioral and Social Sciences Review Committee. (See Appendix A for Human Subject Approval Form.)

Upon receiving the letter from the investigator, Dr. O'Donnell granted permission to obtain the required names and addresses of prospective participants. From December first through mid-December, the investigator collected information by manually recording the data from records notebooks and the computer terminal in the College of Education. The investigator also was provided current addresses of some Ph.D. graduates from the Alumni Information Center.

In mid-December, survey questionnaires were sent to 214 doctoral candidates and graduates. Each candidate and graduate received a personalized letter which specifically mentioned the program area of that survey participant.

Data Collection Procedures. During December 1982, a personalized letter, a questionnaire, and an interview participation
form were sent to each of the 214 Ph.D. candidates and graduates. One-hundred and fifty-two responded; however, one return was unusable; thus the actual number of returns analyzed in the initial survey was 151.

During March 1983, a personalized follow-up letter, a questionnaire, and an interview participation form were sent to each of the 62 Ph.D. candidates and graduates who had not responded in December. (An initial survey letter, a follow-up letter, a questionnaire, and an interview participation form are in Appendix B.) Twenty responded; however, one return was unusable. Therefore the initial survey and the follow-up survey efforts resulted in a total response of 172 or 80.4 percent. Minus the two unusable returns, 82 males and 84 females—a total of 170 respondents—were included in the survey analysis.

The researcher attributes the high 80.4 percent response to several factors. First, each recipient was sent a letter in which his/her field of study was specifically mentioned. Second, the mailings included personalized inside addresses, salutations, and stamped, addressed return envelopes. Third, the letters and the envelopes looked very official: (a) The Ohio State University logo appeared on both, (b) Professor Robert R. Bargar, Educational Foundations and Research, co-signed each letter, and (c) return envelopes were professionally printed in bold lettering and addressed to Dr. Robert R. Bargar, The Ohio State University. Fourth, the questionnaire format gave the impression that the information
requested was extremely easy to complete. Fifth, when initial mailings were returned marked, "Current Address Unknown," the researcher sought other means to get updated addresses; for example, advisors and department secretaries in several cases were able to offer needed information. In another case, the researcher learned that the student's name had changed. Finally, the response rate probably was high on the follow-up mailings because the wording was quite positive and encouraged the reader to respond in the event that the first mailing was "overlooked."

To assure anonymity for the participants, coded numbers were placed in the upper right corner of each initial questionnaire. To designate the follow-up questionnaire, the letter "B" was included with the coded numbers. These same coded numbers with or without the "B," were also marked on the audiotapes for Part B of the study.

Part B

Interviewee Selection. The researcher analyzed initial and follow-up questionnaire data by hand. All percentages for tables were manually computed. As responses for Part A of the study were received, the researcher organized the data according to a coded-number sequence. Six categories were also used as follows:

*1. Males, later stages; participation form included
2. Males, later stages; no participation form
*3. Females, later stages; participation form included
4. Females, later stages; no participation form
5. Males, early stages
6. Females, early stages
The asterisks designated the categories from which prospective interviewees would be selected. Since the researcher only planned to interview persons in later stages, categories five and six were automatically eliminated. Because categories two and four represented respondents who did not return the interview participation form, the possibility of interviewing those persons was also automatically eliminated. Thus only categories one and three had qualified prospective interviewees. From the initial respondents who qualified, there were 31 females and 38 males. The follow-up survey included six females and two males who were qualified prospective interviewees.

Table 1 presents a profile of qualified prospective interviewees by sex, survey phase, and residence location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Location</th>
<th>Initial Survey</th>
<th>Follow-up Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus and Vicinity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Columbus and Vicinity</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because 76.3 percent of the qualified prospective male interviewees responding to the initial survey lived outside the Columbus area, the researcher found it necessary to conduct some interviews by telephone. There were no qualified male respondents in Student
Personnel living in the Columbus area.

The sampling stratification included dissertation stage and sex. Interviewees were selected from two groups. The first group included those respondents who had completed and returned the interview participation forms and who were: (a) analyzing/interpreting data, (b) writing final chapters; and the second group included those respondents who had completed Ph.D. requirements and had filled out and returned the interview participation forms. It was also important to choose convenience samples of 15 women and 15 men to interview to insure that the differences, if any, between the experiences of men and women would be represented in the data.

Other considerations for interviewee selection included:

Area of education: An attempt was made to have a "balance" of men and women in later stages of the dissertation in the four areas of Adult and Vocational-Technical Education, Educational Administration, Educational Foundations and Research, and Student Personnel.

Proximity: It was determined that the majority of interviews should be in person.

Age range: It was thought that some consideration should be made for interviewees in different stages of development.

Satisfaction level: Although 69.1 percent of the males and 56.0 percent of the females in later stages indicated on the questionnaire that they were "very satisfied" with the advisor's help on the dissertation, it was considered important to interview some who had responded less positively to that item.
Employment: It was determined that students working in later stages of the dissertation, employed full time, and living out of state should also be interviewed.

Table 2 shows the profile of interviewees by area of education, sex, and dissertation stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Education</th>
<th>Later Stage</th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult and Vocational-Technical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Foundations and Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher gave the interviewees fictitious names and alphabetized them in the order that the interviews were conducted. The names are as follows:

1. Amy
2. Ben
3. Carol
4. Doug
5. Eve
6. Faith
7. Greg
8. Helen
9. Irene
10. Janet
11. Kent
12. Linda
13. Mark 22. Vera*
14. Neil 23. Walt*
15. Opal 24. Xavier
16. Penny 25. Yancy*
17. Quina 26. Zane*
18. Roger* 27. Anita
19. Stan* 28. Brenda*
20. Trent 29. Clark*
21. Ursula 30. Dave

The first seventeen interviews were conducted in person. Beginning with the eighteenth name, some telephone interviews became necessary. Asterisks designate those eight people interviewed by telephone.

Table 3 lists the age range of interviewees and the degree of satisfaction with adviser's help on the dissertation that the interviewees had indicated on their questionnaire.

Instrumentation. The main purpose of Part B, the unstructured, intensive interview, was to answer the following questions from the perspectives of fifteen men and fifteen women doctoral candidates and graduates who had responded to the survey questionnaires and had completed the interview participation forms:

1. Questions about relationships with others, especially the advisor.
2. Questions about processes involved in students' doctoral endeavors.
3. Questions about significant experiences.
### TABLE 3

**AGE RANGE OF INTERVIEWEES AND DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH ADVISOR'S HELP ON THE DISSERTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Degree of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amy</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ben</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Under 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Carol</td>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Doug</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>35-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Eve</td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faith</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Greg</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Helen</td>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Irene</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Janet</td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kent</td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Linda</td>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>35-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mark</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Opal</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Penny</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Quina</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Roger</td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>Under 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Stan</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Trent</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Ursula</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>35-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Vera</td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Walt</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Under 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Xavier</td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Yancy</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Zane</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>47-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Anita</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Brenda</td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Clark</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>39-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Dave</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>47-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open-ended questions were selected since the premise was that reality is socially constructed. In other words, responses to questions were assumed to reflect the context of the individual's life experience, and the meaning that individual gives to it. Thus the researcher let the interviewees tell their own stories and attempted to grasp the meanings empathically. The descriptive data were then analyzed for recurring themes. Conceptual data emerged from Part B of the study. This qualitative data analysis followed Glaser's constant comparative method which is concerned with

...generating and plausible [sic] suggesting (not provisionally testing) many properties and hypotheses about a general phenomenon....Some of these properties may be causes; but unlike analytic induction others are conditions, consequences, dimensions, types, processes, etc. (Glaser, 1969, p. 219).

Guba and Lincoln (1981) advocate that the interviewer use a non-standardized qualitative method when the investigator is

...operating in a discovery, rather than a verification mode....interested in the etiology of some condition....interested in a direct interaction with a certain respondent...interested in uncovering some motivation, intent, or explanation as held by the respondent....is trying to ascribe meaning to some event, situation, or circumstance (p. 166).

Summary quotes from Guba and Lincoln address the issues of credibility and consistency:

...the naturalistic investigator cannot place very much confidence in single observations or deductions. Each will contain its modicum of error, perhaps sufficient to cause suspension of belief if no other evidence is available. But when various bits of evidence all tend in
one direction, that direction assumes far greater credibility (p. 107).

Consistency...is often not even an issue for the naturalistic inquirer. The implications of the multiple reality for generalizability have been touched on in several contexts; similar arguments can be made in the case of consistency. Moreover, the naturalistic inquirer may be more interested in differences than in similarities. The odd case may intrigue him more than the recurrent regularity ...if the evaluator places emphasis on shoring up validity, reliability will follow (p. 120).

**Data Collection Procedures.** Three pilot interviews were conducted in February 1983 to refine the interview methodology and to give the interviewer practice in the technique of interviewing. Also the interviewer had to purchase and learn how to operate a telephone recording device for the telephone interviews.

From March 15 through April 11, the researcher conducted thirty interviews lasting from about an hour to two and a half hours. Prospective interviewees were contacted by phone at the time they had specified on the interview participation form. Location and time were arranged at their convenience. Twenty-two face-to-face interviews were held in private at such places as the interviewee's office or home and the researcher's home. Eight were telephone interviews. The general interview procedures were as follows:

1. The study was briefly explained, and a relaxed, informal climate was established. The interviewer tried to convey the idea that the interviewee was an expert who could help the interviewer learn about a subject that needed clarification.
(2) The interviewee was assured that all matters discussed would be confidential. The tape was identified with a fictitious name and a number code which the interviewer showed the interviewee. When a telephone interview was conducted, the interviewer explained the use of the fictitious name and the number coding.

(3) The interviewer had the interviewee sign the "Consent for Participation in Social and Behavioral Research Form." (The "Consent Form" is included in Appendix C.) Telephone interviewees were mailed the form to sign, and a stamped, addressed return envelope was included. Also, the following statement was read to the interviewee:

a. You may elect not to answer any question.

b. You may terminate participation and have the audiotape erased.

c. The tape will be used by the interviewer only. It will be used during tabulation of interview results. When the interviewer's dissertation has been approved, the tape will be erased or destroyed.

(4) The methodology was the unstructured, intensive interview. Questions were open-ended. The interview revolved around the following ten questions:

1. How did you select your dissertation topic? Can you explain why you think it happened this way?

2. What do you recall from working with your advisor that is significant to you? Why was it important? What made it meaningful?

3. What was the role of your advisor in your dissertation experience?
4. How frequent have your contacts been with your advisor? What has been the climate of your relationship? What are the most significant areas of assistance provided by your advisor?

5. Have you been satisfied with the extent of help your advisor has given you? Why? Can you offer any comments that would indicate areas in which you were dissatisfied or areas of particular satisfaction?

6. How has your advisor been of particular assistance in readying material for committee review? In proceeding with the dissertation? In preparing for orals?

7. Did you receive significant help from persons other than your major advisor? What particular help did you receive from members of your reading committee? Did anyone else help in the development of your dissertation? In what manner and to what extent?

8. What do you consider to be your least satisfying experience as a doctoral candidate? Your most satisfying experience?

9. Do you believe your dissertation experience has prepared you for future research? Do you intend to write on topics related to your dissertation? If yes, in either case, explain.

10. If you were to start your doctoral work again, what would you do differently?

(5) None of the interviews proceeded from questions one through ten. Most often the interviewer would start by asking, "How did you select your dissertation topic? Can you explain why you think it happened this way?" Then in order to establish a more relaxed rapport, the interviewer would often ask one, two, or all of the following questions:

a. When did you take your generals?
b. When did you finish your proposal?

c. How long did it take from the time that your proposal was accepted to the time you finished your dissertation?

(6) Sometimes the interviewee wanted to talk about his/her own "script." After the "script" had been "talked out," then the interviewee answered the questions on the "agenda."

(7) Sometimes the questions would generate a number of questions that were not on the original list; however, most of the original questions would eventually be "worked into" the interview.

(8) Thank-you notes were sent to all interviewees.

The thirty interviews were recorded on audiotapes. After listening to each tape at least three times, the researcher then wrote a loose transcription of the tapes. Significant quotes were assembled from the ten question areas. The entire time the researcher was using the analytic method of constant comparison in order to report recurring themes and conceptual categories which emerged from the data. Matrix tables were also constructed to examine relationships among data.

Limitations

For purposes of this study, persons chosen for the sample were limited to doctoral candidates and graduates in the College of Education in selected academic areas at The Ohio State University. Conclusions from this population cannot be generalized to other populations. It was not a hypothesis-testing study; instead, it
was qualitative in nature.

Content validity of the survey instrument was established by having the questionnaire reviewed by a panel of experts in the field of graduate education. No tests of construct validity were conducted. Additionally, the reliability of the survey instrument was not determined, although the survey was administered to a pilot group as a means of evaluating it for clarity, appropriateness, and ease of comprehension.
The primary purpose of this two-part study was to investigate responses to questions addressed to Ph.D. candidates and graduates in the following areas:

1. ...relationships with others, especially the advisor.
2. ...processes involved in students' doctoral endeavors.
3. ...significant experiences.

The data analysis of the study is presented in two parts. Chapter IV is reported in two sections: (1) a descriptive profile of respondents by age range, area of education, dissertation stage, present occupation, employment situations of interviewees during dissertation writing, and whether the generals advisor is the same or different from the dissertation advisor; and (2) an analysis of responses to questions concerning the advisor and significant other persons.

1. Professional participation with advisor.
2. Number of contacts with advisor in the last six weeks.

5. Other person(s) who was/were helpful for dissertation progress.

Chapter V, an analysis of the interview data, resulted from the participation of fifteen men and fifteen women who answered the following questions:

1. How did you select your dissertation topic? Can you explain why it happened this way?

2. What do you recall from working with your advisor that is significant to you? Why was it important? What made it meaningful?

3. What was the role of your advisor in your dissertation experience?

4. How frequent have your contacts been with your advisor? What has been the climate of your relationship? What are the most significant areas of assistance provided by your advisor?

5. Have you been satisfied with the extent of help your advisor has given you? Why? Can you offer any comments that would indicate areas in which you were dissatisfied or areas of particular satisfaction?

6. How has your advisor been of particular assistance in readying material for committee review? In proceeding with the dissertation? In preparing for orals?

7. Did you receive significant help from persons other than your major advisor? What particular help did you receive from members of your reading committee? Did anyone else help in the development of your dissertation? In what manner and to what extent?

8. What do you consider to be your least satisfying experience as a doctoral candidate? Your most satisfying experience?
9. Do you believe your dissertation experience has prepared you for future research? Do you intend to write on topics related to your dissertation? If yes, in either case explain.

10. If you were to start your doctoral work again, what would you do differently?

**Part A - Survey Questionnaire Analysis**

Profile of Respondents. Responses to the survey questionnaire, the initial one sent to 214 persons during December 1982, and the follow-up sent to 62 persons during March 1983, resulted in an 80.4 percent response rate. A total of 172 persons answered the questionnaire; however, two questionnaires were unusable. Thus the researcher analyzed 170 survey questionnaires.

Table 4 indicates the male and female respondents by age range. The median age range fell within ages 35 to 38.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-38 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-42 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-46 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-50 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 identifies the male and female respondents by area of education.

**TABLE 5**

**PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS BY AREA OF EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Education</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult and Vocational-Technical</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Foundations and Research</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 summarizes the dissertation stage of the respondents. Early dissertation stages were considered as: (1) working on proposal, and (2) proposal accepted, work begun on study. Later dissertation stages were (3) analyzing/interpreting data, (4) writing final chapters, and (5) have completed requirements for the Ph.D. Categories one and five had the most respondents.

Appendix D includes a comprehensive listing of men and women respondents' present employment. Employment responses were helpful for selecting interviewees for Part B of the study. In order to keep the same group parameters, it was considered important to interview those respondents who worked on and off campus during the time they wrote their dissertations and those working on campus and off campus presently while they are completing the writing of their dissertations.
TABLE 6
PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS BY DISSERTATION STAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' Stage</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working on proposal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal accepted. Work begun on study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing/interpreting data</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing final chapters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have completed requirements for the Ph.D.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing/interpreting and writing final chapters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                                  | 84 | 100.0| 86 | 100.0|

Three interviewees were unemployed at the time they were writing final dissertation chapters.

Table 7 shows interviewees selected for participation in Part B of the study by employment situations during their dissertation writing.

Table 8 indicates whether the advisee's generals advisor is the same or different from his/her dissertation advisor.

Responses to Questions Concerning the Advisory and Significant Other Persons. The researcher intends to summarize the responses to the survey questionnaire to communicate the diversity and depth
**TABLE 7**

EMPLOYMENT SITUATIONS OF INTERVIEWEES DURING DISSERTATION WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Later Stage</th>
<th>Working Part Time</th>
<th>Working Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and Finishing Dissertation</td>
<td>On Campus (GAA, GRA, or GTA) and Finishing Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Full Time Off Campus and Finishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Amy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vera*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yancy*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed When Completing Ph.D.</td>
<td>Worked Full Time</td>
<td>Worked Full Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Full Time Off Campus When Completing</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Carol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Greg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Opal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quina</td>
<td>Roger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>Stan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zane</td>
<td>Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lives out of state.

Note: Pseudonyms were assigned to maintain anonymity.
TABLE 8

PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS BY SAME OR DIFFERENT DISSERTATION ADVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent's situation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation advisor is the same</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation advisor is different</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of participants' perceptions.

Questionnaire Item 1: "Professional Participation with Advisor."

The choices on the questionnaire to this item included:

Addressed a professional group
Assisted in a research project
Co-authored a publication
Presented off-campus instruction
Taught in advisor's class
No participation with advisor
Other: _______________________

It would seem rather significant that 94 respondents or 55.3 percent out of 170 indicated that they had had no participation with their advisors. In addition, two did not respond to questionnaire item one. Appendix E includes respondents' comments to the blank entitled, "other."

Table 9 lists the total responses to item one and indicates number of activities respondents marked.

Table 10 enumerates participation starting with one activity and continuing through six activities which respondents checked.
### TABLE 9

PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION WITH ADVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Level</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No participation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One activity</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10

PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION WITH ADVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enumeration of Participation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1--Addressed a professional group.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--Taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--Other.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--Assisted in a research project.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--Co-authored a publication.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--Presented off-campus instruction.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Addressed a professional group and other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Addressed a professional group, assisted in a research project.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Assisted in a research project and other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumeration of Participation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Addressed a professional group, presented off-campus instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Assisted in a research project, taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Taught in advisor's class and other.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Co-authored a publication, presented off-campus instruction.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Co-authored a publication and other.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Addressed a professional group, taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Addressed a professional group, assisted in a research project, taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Addressed a professional group, presented off-campus instruction, taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Addressed a professional group, assisted in a research project, co-authored a publication.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Addressed a professional group, co-authored a publication.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Presented off-campus instruction, taught in advisor's class and other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--Addressed a professional group, assisted in a research project, presented off-campus instruction, taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--Addressed a professional group, assisted in a research project, co-authored a publication, taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--Addressed a professional group, assisted in a research project, co-authored a publication, taught in advisor's class (since graduated).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--Addressed a professional group, co-authored a publication, presented off-campus instruction, taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Addressed a professional group, assisted in a research project, co-authored a publication, presented off-campus instruction, taught in advisor's class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Item 2: "Approximate Number of Contacts with Your Advisor in the Last Six Months to Discuss Your Dissertation."
The choices on the questionnaire to this item included:

- Five times or less
- More than five times

Table 11 shows the approximate number of contacts an advisee had with his/her advisor in the last six months to discuss the dissertation.

Blanks were provided below the two check-off items for the respondent to comment on duration of meetings and degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with his/her advisor during those meetings. Varying responses resulted.

Overall, men and women in later stages responded very positively and specifically to the question concerning duration of meetings and degree of satisfaction with their advisors when they
### TABLE 11
**APPROXIMATE CONTACT WITH ADVISOR IN LAST SIX MONTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Stage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Later Stage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five times or less</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five times or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with old advisor;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more than five times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five times or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with new advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were writing the dissertation. Typical comments include:

The duration of meetings varied in length. Sometimes we would meet for a half hour, and at other times for almost two hours. My advisor always made himself available. I was quite satisfied with the meetings. Most of the time, it was a matter of discussing ideas or concepts within my data.

In the last six months of work on the dissertation, I met with my advisor almost weekly. In the last weeks of writing, I met two or three times a week, plus short phone conversations to set up appointments or check on minor matters. He was always willing to assist.

During the writing stage we met two to three times a week minimally for two to four hours. Excellent rapport with advisor; high degree of satisfaction with meetings; would not trade advisor for the world!

My advisor met with me whenever I needed him. He would also set up future dates for meetings in the event I would need him. He was very helpful and encouraging. My advisor was fantastic and very knowledgeable in his field of expertise.

He gave me very specific feedback with each meeting. His critiques of my work were always meaningful.

Meetings were short (less than one hour), focused and satisfying.

I met with my advisor at least two or three times a week prior to completing the degree. The degree of satisfaction varied, depending on how well I completed a writing assignment.

The meetings were relaxed, specific, and productive. It would be extremely difficult to find a professor who works better with students than my advisor. He seems to be very competent in directing Ph.D. students.

This is in reference to the six months prior to completion of my dissertation. Duration of meetings was approximately 15 to 20 minutes and very generally satisfactory.

My advisor met with me as often as necessary. He spent many hours reviewing, correcting, and modifying my dissertation. He was excellent! My committee passed my study with minor revisions. This would not have happened without my advisor's support.

Most meetings lasted about an hour. At critical points in the process I was given all the time needed--sometimes over 1-1/2 hours. I was very satisfied with the assistance given. Sometimes we wandered off the subject, but not often. We have a good relationship, and I count him as a friend.

Forty-five to sixty minutes in his office; very well satisfied.

Highly satisfied. Meetings ranged from thirty minutes to two hours. Most were scheduled, but a few on drop-in basis. Meetings were usually geared toward dissertation research, but personal problems were also discussed.
Very well satisfied with availability of advisor and his cooperation on matters of procedure.

Excellent levels of communication and follow through. Very prompt in replies. Supportive and encouraging. Professional.

Only one negative comment came out of the responses from men working in later stages:

Meetings generally lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. On a scale of one to five, with 5 indicating 'very satisfied,' my degree of satisfaction would be 3.

From the nearly sixty responses from women in later stages, there were only eight negative comments as follows:

As I was writing my dissertation, my meetings were every two weeks to once a month. The duration of those meetings was generally less than one hour, and my satisfaction with those meetings was usually minimal. My advisor rarely remembered my topic, let alone any problems I was encountering. In short, he was very uninterested in my research, even though it was supposedly in his area of specialty.

Student initiated all or nearly all contacts. Increasingly supportive in final stages but truly gave little or no guidance for either dissertation content or OSU processes--deadlines, forms, etc.

During the last 1-1/2 to 2 years of dissertation preparation I met with my advisor approximately three times to discuss progress. Meetings were satisfactory; however, the other two members of my committee were more helpful because of their expertise in the subject matter and research process.

Approximately 1/2 hour--twice. Mild dissatisfaction with dissertation guidance. Lack of agreement among committee members. My original enthusiasm has waned considerably. I'm feeling disillusioned at this point.
Very little advising occurred. I would basically prepare my work and give it to him a week before I saw him. Most of the activity on the part of the advisor was in the form of editing. Major issues, such as delimiting the scope of the study, research questions, and methodology were not discussed early in our association. Consequently, the process took much longer than necessary because I had to figure it all out by myself.

It isn't easy to get in to see my advisor: long waits for appointments; a lot of 'double booking' and cancelled appointments. Because of this, I tended to call him or meet with him only in times of 'crisis.' When I did meet with him, he was generally helpful, concerned, etc. and in those relatively few times, I was satisfied. Would have liked more and easier access to him though.

Meetings have been sufficiently long for me to report on the current status of the dissertation. Advisor is flexible and supportive and offers suggestions of a procedural nature. Regret that advisor never initiates any contact to see how things are going.

1. Difficult to get appointments. 2. Little assistance on substantive issues--comments usually focused on editorial issues. 3. Majority of meetings spent on listening to my advisor tell me how busy he is.

Men and women working in early stages indicated more frustrations and dissatisfactions than later stage respondents. The typical range of responses from early stage respondents includes:

I have a running dialogue with my advisor on the dissertation. The ideas it is to contain are not just seen as cogs for the wheel of an academic accomplishment, but are reviewed and talked about as if they are significant themselves, and they come up in conversation more often than the weather. I don't need appointments to talk specifically about the dissertation.
For the past two years I have been making little progress on the formalizing of my proposal. In this context then, I have known what was needed to begin a more intense working relationship with my advisor. My own initiative in progressing is the only hold up.

Am changing advisors as former advisor and I did not have similar views concerning our roles.

Five times or less-old advisor; more than five times-new advisor.

Since my advisor is also my boss, and part of the work I do is part of my dissertation project, I have a lot of contact with him concerning my dissertation. He is very generous with his time and has put in a tremendous effort in helping me with my academic work.

About thirty minutes. Very satisfied. Constructive and helpful suggestions.

Have seen/spoken to advisor on several occasions. He never mentioned dissertation or proposal. In each case I had to bring up the issue. Very little feedback given.

The meetings have been short and slightly unsatisfactory because of the time pressure my advisor was under with other things.

Really very dissatisfied.

General satisfaction.

Short with low satisfaction.

Short phone calls less than five minutes. Short meetings less than half an hour. Very satisfied.

Questionnaire Item 3: "Influence of Advisor on Dissertation Topic Selection." The choices to check on this item were:

Determined the topic.
Very influential, but did not determine the topic.
Somewhat influential.
Had no influence.
"Very influential, but did not determine the topic" was the response of 43.1 percent of the men and 41.7 percent of the women who were later stage Ph.D. candidates and graduates. Early stage females perceived their advisors to have less significant influence on topic selection than early stage males and later stage males and females. Table 12 illustrates the influence of the advisor on the dissertation topic selection as was indicated by men and women in early and later stages of the dissertation.

### Table 12

**Influence of Advisor on Dissertation Topic Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Stage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Later Stage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined the topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very influential, but did not determine the topic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat influential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had no influence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blanks under the four items to check were provided for the respondent to explain the nature of his/her advisor's contribution to the dissertation topic selection. Several very diverse categories of responses resulted.

The majority of later stage respondents indicated the advisor's interest in the topic was the most important influence the advisor
had on the topic selection. Typical comments included:

The interest identified came from a mutual concern during my first quarter back in school. My advisor gets A+ for influencing thinking, suggesting resources, linking me to other professionals with mutual interest.

We discussed my interest and mutually agreed on a topic.

My advisor was interested in the general nature of the topic long before he met me. My interest developed as a result of my contact with him through coursework and past experiences with the topic. However, what my dissertation became and what he had in mind were very far apart.

My advisor kept abreast of my interest and suggested some topics of current and timely controversy--and it was an effective way to direct my thinking.

My advisor suggested the topic which was of immediate interest to me and matched my background well. I was pleased to have been offered the follow-up study opportunity.

I selected the topic I wished to research. It happened to be in an area in which my advisor had previously conducted some research. However, the determination of what was to be done and how to do it was mine. My interest in the area was influenced by the previous work done by my advisor.

He has worked on prior research in the area, but the topic decision was mine.

My advisor continued to return to this topic, rejecting all others until I agreed to take on this one. My alternative would have been to change advisors--I should have!

He has worked in one of the areas my dissertation dealt with.

He had an interest in the topic and wanted me to do research concerning it. I felt I had to agree and am glad I did.
My advisor would work with me only if I selected a general topic which he was interested in. Fortunately we were both interested in my topic.

We both had input into the selection of a dissertation topic.

Mutual interest in the topic area.

Some later stage respondents indicated that their topic selection was based on their coursework, personal and/or professional interests. The following responses reflect these influences:

The topic which I chose was an outgrowth of personal and professional work interest and experience.

Started program knowing what I wanted to research.

I had selected my topic before I entered the Ph.D. program and used course assignments as an opportunity to synthesize and integrate the literature.

I entered the program with a general idea, self conceived. My coursework fostered my idea, and my change in advisor was related to his area of expertise.

The topic grew out of an independent study class I took with my advisor.

My advisor allowed my topic to evolve from my graduate experiences and interests.

Early stage respondents also indicated that topic selection was often mutual and frequently was based on the advisee's personal and professional experience and/or interest:

I'm working on a university research grant with my advisor, and my proposal is an offshoot of the grant.

By discussing a number of topics and agreeing on one that was of interest to both of us.
We are still exploring possibilities. Several ideas are being developed.

He is able to clarify with me my interests and at the same time bring his perspective to the focus of the research based at least in part on what he feels is appropriate. I like that.

Whether or not selection of the topic was based on the advisee's background and was a rather independent choice, or the topic was selected out of mutual interests, or was primarily based on the advisor's interest, the advisor seems to have had a definite influence on the topic being transformed into something that is considered "focused," "manageable," "narrowed," "refined," "reoriented," "reshaped," or "workable." Examples follow.

Through discussions my ideas were clarified and reshaped.

I chose the final topic from a list I had compiled. Advisor gave some help in narrowing and refining list and final scope of topic.

He helped me to focus my topic to make it manageable.

I proposed a topic, and it was accepted. Of course, there was much refinement.

Aided me in taking a global concern and narrowing it down to a researchable topic appropriate for a dissertation.

Made suggestions relative to the modification of my original topic such that it was as much his as mine.

Assisted in selection of a topic which was reasonable in scope and of significance to the field of study.

Helped to narrow the focus.

Basically he approved my topic. He did offer some suggestions for refining it.
I came up with the ideas. He gave the go-ahead. There were several 'false starts.' [Requiring refining?]

I chose the subject. He reoriented to a point. He helped me shape my approach to understanding and exploring my topic once I had selected it.

My advisor helped me with the finer points of my dissertation.

My advisor helped me reduce an original proposal idea to a workable research project that I could handle.

I suggested the topic, and he helped me develop it, expand my ideas, and then focus.

Questionnaire Item 4: "Degree of Satisfaction with Advisor's Help on Dissertation." The choices to check for this item included:

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

"Very satisfied" was rated highest by both early and later stage dissertation respondents than any other category. Slightly over 69 percent of the men and 55 percent of the women in later stages indicated that they were "very satisfied."

Table 13 indicates that women, especially in early stages, were less satisfied than men with the help given by the advisor on the dissertation.

The directions "comment or explain" were given for the respondent to elaborate on his/her degree of satisfaction with his/her advisor. Very diverse responses resulted from comments written on item four.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Early Stages</th>
<th>Later Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>13 50.0</td>
<td>10 38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>4 15.6</td>
<td>6 23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>1 3.7</td>
<td>4 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>2 7.6</td>
<td>3 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very, very, satisfied</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied with new advisor; very dissatisfied with old advisor</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied/somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6 23.1</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26 100.0</td>
<td>26 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When expressing a high, positive degree of satisfaction with the advisor's help on the dissertation, both later stage men and women commented most frequently on the advisor's expertise in dissertation methodology, expedition of procedures--including work with other committee members, critical evaluation of the subject area, data analysis, and/or editing; and/or his availability; and/or his supportive, caring attitude--sometimes extended into the advisee's personal life. These highly satisfied advisees by no means had
idyllic, trouble-free experiences with their dissertation endeavors; in fact, frustration at some point was another common element that emerged from a number of their responses. Typical comments from highly satisfied respondents included:

He was and is a superb editor! He suggested ways to strengthen the dissertation, right up to the last minute. He was 'tough,' but gave me lots of confidence in my own abilities.

He provided what I needed--active guidance at times and stand-by assistance during my plodding periods.

His focus was on global issues, the broad scope, and how I could select a few aspects to deal with in a comprehensive way. His patience, sensitivity, and belief in me during times of despair were the most important.

I work more in the affective domain--even though I am very analytical. My advisor was a true empiricist; therefore, he kept me 'honest' and readable! My advisor was one of the finest scholars that I came in contact with during my years at the university.

He has more ideas on how to do research than I thought possible. He listens well, pushes me to explore key ideas, assists but does not do the work for me, etc.

Very helpful in the initial phases on the choice of topic, narrowing the scope, logistics of the methodology, and trying to secure a research grant.... He was also challenging and critical, but allowed a great deal of autonomy as I developed my proposal and wrote my chapters. I commend my advisor. He was also extremely supportive when my father died during the later stages of my writing.

Provided continuous input when asked; although each time we met, another variable was added to the study.
Told me outright what he thought. This meant rewrite after rewrite which strengthened the final version and condensed it also.

I now have a Ph.D. What else can I say? Without his assistance, I'd still be wandering in the wilderness! Sometimes he was a little frustrating--seemed to give advice that conflicted with his earlier advice.

My advisor was quite helpful, although at times I was frustrated. As I look back, his influence made the entire project possible.

I was off campus for most of my writing phase. I called my advisor at all times of the day or night, and he always assisted. Further he was prompt in reviewing my rough drafts. His encouragement carried me throughout the rough times.

Later stage males and females who expressed high degree of dissatisfaction with the advisor's help on the dissertation mentioned that the advisor lacked knowledge or interest in the study, was not easily available, was extremely slow in returning drafts, emphasized format rather than substantive issues, and was vague and/or changed his mind on "agreements" which had been made. The thirteen negative comments from the fifty-eight males and sixty females who were in later stages are listed:

Major source of dissatisfaction is his lack of knowledge about the data analysis technique. Some people say you do it 'this way,' and he thinks you do it 'that way.'

(1) Difficulty getting appointments.
(2) Needed more substantive direction.

He did not have time (or did not make time) to help as he should have. When we did meet, he had not done his homework. He asked other people to do his work and then consult me. I felt intimidated and almost quit the program.
I have never been so discouraged. I finally spoke to a committee member whom I trusted and together we got the process on its way without alienating the chairperson. I went a co-chairperson route. Thank goodness for two supportive committee members who helped me get the chair to move.

Sometimes difficult to reach.

My advisor never expanded my thinking or asked me the conceptual questions I needed. Instead, he seemed more concerned with the format of the study--'the way it's supposed to be.'

I continually had the feeling that my research was not worth my advisor's time. His comments were never 'substantive,' nor did they indicate that he had even read what I had written or re-written. Yet he had a knack for finding errors in punctuation!

Most criticism was on format rather than content. Limited knowledge of current issues except those focused on traditional topics.

Advisor often changed his mind after changes had been made. This was somewhat frustrating to the writer.

Probably showed less interest than would have been the case if dissertation had been more in line with advisor's personal interests.

Basically helpful, but was slow in reading drafts such that the process dragged on and had with it attendant agonies.

He changed the agreements we made on either form or content continuously. I wasted a lot of time rewriting because of this reason.

Sometimes it would be months before he would return material. This was infuriating. Sometimes his instructions were vague--but that was my problem. Finally I was satisfied, but there were moments when I was less than satisfied.

It was sometimes difficult to schedule an appointment at the time when the conference
was needed. Sometimes the problem of issue in question would be resolved before I could see my advisor.

While many early stage respondents were satisfied with the advisor's help on the dissertation, this group had more negative responses than the later stage males and females. One said, "Good so far--really too early to tell." Two responses that are typical of dissatisfied early stage males are:

He is unwilling or unable to engage in meaningful dialogue about conceptual issues and approaches.

Little or no encouragement.

One early stage respondent wants to change to another advisor but "...cannot because of politics within the department." Another is considering changing to another advisor. Reasons are explained as follows:

We are not interested in the same specific areas, although our broad interests are in common. He gives conflicting instructions on the proposal, expected products for independent studies, etc. He is more interested in his grants than in his students.

Very positive comments from early stage males and females include:

My advisor guides and gives useful explanation and relevant literature.

Very supportive, many helpful ideas.

He is available when I need to talk with him and indicates he will spend whatever additional time I request whenever necessary.
My advisor has a special knack of prodding my own thoughts through his supportive assurance and his intuitive sense of appropriate direction. While I am completely satisfied with his help, I am impatient to 'settle' on the research question.

Perhaps the same advisor is seen positively by one advisee and negatively by another. Although the following two comments are by different advisees about two different advisors, the contrasts in the advisees' perceptions are striking.

My advisor was rather non-directive—and open about being so. At times it seemed that part of the 'game' was to figure out his meaning.

I did not receive a great deal of direction or advice from my advisor in later stages of dissertation development and was very comfortable with this arrangement.

Not all advisors help extensively with the fine points of the dissertation. While several respondents complained about an advisor's lack of expertise in statistics or the particular subject area, several comments were positive. Perhaps the advisor's "honest approach" was helpful for certain advisees.

Even though my advisor is not an expert in the area, he took a great deal of interest to understand the area of study and the research methodology based on a critical theory of ____ that he himself does not completely agree with.

I did not rely on his help because he did not have the expertise. However, I was fortunate in that my advisor was very supportive. He did not seem to mind that I sought the help of other committee members and encouraged me to contact them as long as I kept him (my advisor) informed of progress.
Two particularly memorable comments to end item four are:

My advisor was facilitative to me as a student and was a team member. My advisor allowed me my struggle, yet was supportive. He also gave me strokes—e.g. saying, 'I can't believe you are this far along already,' or 'I can't believe you've done this.' No one will ever know how much that meant to me. He left me whole—his criticism was always productive to me in ways that allowed me to refocus and change.

My advisor's assistance goes beyond description. His dedication toward his students is quite admirable. Before checking into the hospital for major surgery, he scheduled my defense. Before his operation, he edited my dissertation. What else can I say?

Questionnaire Item 5: "Other Person(s) Who Was/Were Helpful for Your Dissertation Progress." The choices for this item are as follows:

- Reading committee member(s)
- Professor not on reading committee
- Other(s): _________________________

"Reading committee members" was the most popular response for both men and women in early and later stages. Over 48 percent of the males and 40 percent of the females in later stages checked only that category.

Table 14 illustrates the other person(s) who were helpful for early stage and later stage respondents' dissertation progress.

"Explain how person(s) was/were helpful" offered a variety of descriptions concerning how certain people had helped Ph.D. candidates and graduates with their dissertation progress.
### TABLE 14
OTHER PERSON(S) WHO WERE HELPFUL FOR DISSERTATION PROGRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Stages</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Later Stages</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td></td>
<td>M  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading committee member(s)</td>
<td>8  30.8</td>
<td>9  34.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>28  48.3</td>
<td>24  40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor not on reading committee</td>
<td>2  7.7</td>
<td>1  3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1.7</td>
<td>2  3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading committee member(s); professor not on reading committee</td>
<td>1  3.8</td>
<td>3  11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6  10.3</td>
<td>4  6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(s)</td>
<td>4  15.4</td>
<td>1  3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4  6.9</td>
<td>7  11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading committee member(s); professor not on reading committee; other(s)</td>
<td>1  3.8</td>
<td>2  7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2  3.4</td>
<td>5  8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading committee member(s); other(s)</td>
<td>2  7.7</td>
<td>3  11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8  13.8</td>
<td>12 20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor not on reading committee; other(s)</td>
<td>0  0.0</td>
<td>0  0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2  3.4</td>
<td>0  0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8  30.8</td>
<td>7  26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>7  12.2</td>
<td>6  10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26 100.0</td>
<td>26 100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>58 100.0</td>
<td>60 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For many students the committee members had a tremendous impact on the development of their dissertations. Committee integrity was a desirable design component for the committee formation. Responses very often indicated that committee members were chosen for their professional expertise. Typical of this idea was one
student's comment: "Each of my committee members was selected for an area of expertise. Each member contributed as anticipated."

General functions of the committee were best expressed by the following:

Reading committee members offered their experience and background related to my topic and were very helpful in redirecting and refocusing me if I got "off task."

Each reading committee member has provided positive and insightful information. This has provided me with a very positive research experience.

Suggestions, comments, and criticisms from committee members enabled me to produce the final acceptable draft of the dissertation.

Reading committee members gave critiques and direction and also personal support.

In some cases, a particular member of the committee was instrumental in assisting with both professional and personal support. Such is the following example:

One committee person has always taken a personal interest in me and my Ph.D. program. She assumed much of the role of a major advisor, partly because she knew the limitations of my advisor and partly because of her own interests. It was she who guided me, prodded me in rough times, critically read and commented on my writing, and otherwise helped with my progress.

Other comments related to a committee member who was especially instrumental in lending assistance included:

The research person on my committee has been extremely supportive and helpful.

Because I had a dual major, another committee member worked more closely with me on the
dissertation since the subject dealt primarily in his area.

The person to whom I have turned for help, encouragement, or debriefing is a committee member from another department who I share much more in common in terms of professional interest. He also is extremely knowledgeable about the type of research I am involved in doing.... In essence, my advising has only minimally come from my major department area.

One committee member greatly assisted me in the review of the literature.

The third committee member was the most knowledgeable in my area.

One particular committee member was the best help any student could have.

One student discussed the team effort that occurred between his advisor and a particular committee member:

A professor on my reading committee knew the detailed aspects of operationalizing the study--computer programming, quantitative analysis, and literature specific to my topic. He provided the nitty gritty guidance while my advisor provided the global view and superb editorial guidance. Together they were a good 'team,' each an expert in a different aspect. I am fortunate to have benefited from two such superior persons.

The team concept was also expressed in terms of the committee members bringing particular skills to the dissertation endeavor.

One member helped me narrow my focus. She also was supportive in expressing understanding of the frustration that I was experiencing while I was trying to manage all my data. The other two members assisted in interpretation of my data and in helping me think in different ways about my study and preliminary results.
One member was a researcher and helped critique my experimental design. Another member had expertise in instructional design and helped with my topic design. This second person also put me in contact with other resource people who were helpful.

A research methodologist and statistician were on my committee. They provided advice on statistical analyses. They also read chapter drafts and provided comments. The two reading committee members were also very supportive of my work, and I had ready access to them whenever I needed assistance.

The following response represents the team effort idea and also emphasizes the importance this particular student gave to the editing role of one committee member:

One member was instrumental in analytic scoring of some of my data. Another member, who fairly recently completed his own dissertation, assisted by being a very 'picky' reader of my proposal and drafts. My committee chairperson provides more intellectual and moral support. He is not such a keen editor--a role played by the younger committee member.

One student indicated that the committee did more on drafts than the advisor until the last draft when the advisor did more than the committee members. Another student mentioned that her dissertation subject was more in line with other reading members' personal interests than with her advisor's. Such examples and the two that follow clearly show that sometimes conflicts occurred within the committee structure--particularly between the advisor and other committee members.

A reading committee member read my work more carefully than my advisor did. This helped me but I felt caught between the two also. (A
professor not on the reading committee urges me to just get it done and says that this is one big game!)

Committee members gave faster feedback on chapter and questionnaire drafts and also provided a different perspective on the topic. However, sometimes this perspective had to be reconciled with that of the advisor's before it could be incorporated into the dissertation.

A concluding idea concerning help from committee members is expressed best by the student who stated, "Persons on my reading committee were helpful in presenting points of view my advisor and I had not considered." That statement illustrates a fundamental strength of a committee—diversity of expertise. It also reflects a common conflict—the committee process may not always lead to harmonious consensus.

Some respondents mentioned professors not on their committees who facilitated their dissertation progress. One professor, for example, reviewed the instruments used in a student's study. Another student received assistance on research design and statistical analysis from a math professor. "Enormous" was the word that student used to describe his help. A third student summarized the impact that "outside" professors had thusly:

The majority of the professors I worked with were very helpful and appreciative of my progress. I think Ohio State has some of the very best professors any university would want to have on its faculty, especially in the College of Education.
Experts, excluding advisors and committee members, were named by a number of respondents. Statisticians, research designers, and computer programmers were frequently alluded to by students:

Statistical assistance persons helped me set up my survey for easy computerized statistical interpretation.

I had help from other researchers at OSU and one particular OSU staff member.

The statistics department was helpful, as were other resource people.

A statistical consulting service, the data processing service, and research graduate student consultants were helpful.

Persons who participated in the doctoral student's study were also mentioned. One student noted that staff members of an institution, the subject of his dissertation, had been very helpful. These persons were credited for providing support, encouragement, and access to subjects. One rather specific example includes:

Fellow two-year college administrators participated in two 'pre-pilot' interview sessions to help me better define my notions of subject context and to phrase my research questions sensibly.

Fellow graduate students were mentioned as being helpful for dissertation progress. "Doctoral students were willing to discuss the doctoral process and my topic," constituted one response. Another mentioned that those who had completed their dissertations recently gave general encouragement and showed a willingness to sit down and talk about specific issues. Still another said
that fellow graduate students helped keep him focused on completion and allowed him to "bounce" ideas off them at every phase of development. One person credited both graduate school peers and herself:

> Probably the most helpful people over the long term have been my friends and fellow graduate students. They have been most helpful because I have spent more time talking to them about various issues facing me in writing the dissertation. One particular woman friend doesn't know it, but she has helped me overcome my fear of computers. Finally, I have been helpful to myself. I have kept a journal on my progress and use it a lot.

Other related responses included friends and family. "Friends were equally important because they provided encouragement and support throughout the process," and "Friends suggested reading materials and made suggestions as to things I should include or omit." Spouses were specifically referred to by three out of 170 respondents. Those three quotes are:

> My wife was very understanding.

> My husband gave editorial assistance and assistance with logical presentation. Reading committee members and a colleague at work provided substantive assistance I needed, such as help in clarifying concepts and addressing controversial points.

> My husband on the faculty at OSU was very helpful regarding the process of dissertation writing, support, understanding of what I was going through, etc.

Work associates offered another group of persons who were helpful for dissertation progress. "Employer provided ideas--mentor questions. He forced me to think toward a broader scope." Two
respondents attributed help that they had received from associations resulting from full or part-time employment in a university setting:

My graduate associateship supervisor, the associate provost, and a provost at another university were involved in the problem I investigated and gave generously of their time and effort.

Colleagues at work. I was fortunate to have both a professional and an academic community to support research efforts. Statistical consultation, computer programming and practical help; i.e., judging, rating photographs, came from professionals. Reading committee members reviewed proposals, suggested strategies, provided encouragement.

Each of the examples that concludes item five represents the most common response; that is, a number of persons in combined categories were helpful for doctoral students' dissertation progress.

An adjunct professor not on the reading committee was helpful. Also colleagues at my present place of employment were helpful in identification of topic, technique, methodology, and editing.

Work associates. Professor not on my committee. Reading committee. All groups helped provide information and act as 'sounding boards.'

Reading committee members—a great team! Others included the students whom I interviewed for my study, and a friend who was an objective person who listened and criticized my writing before I presented it to my committee.

Summary

The summary of major findings for Part A of this study is included on page 147 of Chapter VI.
In the second phase of the study, fifteen women and fifteen men enumerated their perceptions of the doctoral experience by responding to ten interview questions. Diverse, significant responses to these questions were summarized through the use of the constant comparative method.

**Part B - Interview Analysis**

Question 1: How did you select your dissertation topic? Can you explain why it happened this way?

The advisor, it would seem, was the most significant influence on the dissertation topic selection for the majority of interviewees. Eve and Quina, however, were the two exceptions to this generalization. Both chose their dissertation topics prior to starting their doctoral programs.

Eve chose ____, which was her "first love," when she wrote her Master's thesis. The doctoral dissertation was a different design, but the same topic. Eve felt that her advisor did not understand some of the charts and sections of her dissertation, although he was very supportive both of her as a person and of her research. Two other members of the committee were more important; namely, one
member was responsible for helping her develop the experimental design; another member worked with her on the statistical analysis.

Quina developed her interest in ____ when she was employed at a university many years before she actually began working on her Bachelor's degree. Later she worked at OSU when she was completing her Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Her supervisor, also a professor, became her dissertation advisor. Quina explained:

I actually selected my dissertation topic many years ago before I ever went to school as an undergraduate. I had been the administrative assistant to a head administrator in a higher-education setting and became fascinated with the whole issue of ____. (Quina)

Anita, Brenda, Janet, Opal and Trent were encouraged by their advisors to pursue topics that they had studied in doctoral courses prior to taking their generals. Trent pursued his original topic after completing generals; Opal, on the other hand, worked with her advisor until the topic evolved into a very different form. Explanations by Trent and Opal follow:

I selected my topic on the basis of some courses. I was taking a minor in business, and I wanted to apply business to education. In my first course--accounting--I 'stumbled' across some ideas that were 'great,' and I was unaware of anything like that being done in education. So that was kind of like a lightbulb being turned on, and this idea evolved before I took my generals. (Trent)

After generals I had four topics that I was interested in. It was a process of elimination in terms of interest, what was feasible for the time I had, what was manageable, what was relevant. It got to the point where I narrowed down one topic and wrote a proposal. My advisor and I discussed the proposal and decided that it
would be best served to test a model, so I had to rework the whole proposal again. So my topic was really a second generation of a third idea of it. (Opal)

Prior teaching experience was the basis for topic selection for Amy, Carol and Ben. Carol's advisor encouraged her to get a grant, which was also related to her Graduate Teaching Associateship. Helen's advisor also encouraged her to apply for funding for her dissertation research, although her topic was primarily an outgrowth of her study of a particular book that she felt needed further research.

Neil, Roger, and Ursula developed topics which were related to their advisor's area of expertise. Neil was interested in a data base that his advisor had been working on for ten years and felt very flattered when his advisor suggested that they might collaborate on a book. Roger, liking his advisor's specialty area, felt that his own approach to the topic was "new and different." Ursula explained that she wanted an innovative topic because her advisor also was very interested in current areas:

I was looking for something that was more innovative. Something that was new. I didn't want to do something that someone else had done, a redoing or a replication. When I started reading and doing some coursework I kept hearing ____. It was a new band-wagon in town. And I was curious about it. So I went to my advisor, and we talked and discussed it several times. He's an extremely innovative person--always 'up' on what's new. (Ursula)

Administrative experience influenced topic selection by Linda and Clark. Linda was disappointed that her advisor did not bother to really learn as much as he could about her area, while Clark seemed satisfied with his advisor's interest. Clark described his topic
selection as:

It was a topic of interest that I had. Since I had worked as that type of administrator, I wanted to pursue the study of such administrators as it related to the topic of . I had done quite a bit of work toward the literature review prior to taking my general exams. (Clark)

With their advisors' encouragement, Doug, Faith, Mark, Vera, and Xavier developed their topics from experiences they had had as Graduate Research Associates and Graduate Administrative Associates. Xavier and Vera elaborate on their topics:

I just sort of 'fell' into it. I only ever wrote one actual proposal. I considered several other topics, but I quickly narrowed down the area and then wrote one proposal. I produced this topic as a publication for the center where I worked as an RA. Now I'm expanding that product into a dissertation. (Xavier)

My topic developed from a project I had when I was serving an internship at the center. I constructed my committee around my interests, and my support-group people at the center were really my mentors. (Vera)

Irene and Stan had narrowed their dissertation topics prior to taking their general examinations. Both their advisors directed questions on their exams to their selected topics. Irene had a comprehensive general examination in which all members of her committee asked questions that related to her being an administrator in a particular institutional setting and how she would deal with certain hypothetical situations. Stan explained how his topic evolved from a journal article and how his advisor incorporated questions concerning his dissertation topic into his general examination as follows:
An article published in a journal in higher education gave a very interesting and creative methodology for studying a particular topic. So I took a very creative methodology, as shared by my doctoral advisor, and applied it to some of my own interests and did a research study which applied to an administrative population which I wanted to research. I began to substantiate the topical areas for my research prior to taking generals. In fact, one of my questions for the general exam focused on my interest in that area and gave me greater direction in terms of my future research. (Stan)

Dave and Zane worked closely with their advisors on topics related to their full-time work experiences. Both felt that their chapter revisions were more challenging phases of their dissertations than their topic selections. Penny and Kent, on the other hand, had difficulty implementing their topics. Both found that their initial topics were unfeasible, mainly because they could not get enough participants for their studies. Penny resolved her problem by changing her study from Columbus to her own hometown. Kent resolved his problem by changing his topic.

After taking general examinations, Greg, Yancy, and Walt had difficulty selecting their dissertation topics. All three found that by working with their advisors, they were able to develop workable, focused topics. Their explanations are listed respectively:

My advisor examined the various ideas for topics that I had and wasn't necessarily positive or negative about any of them, but tried to guide me into an area that seemed to be of interest to me. He took into account my business experience, my teaching experience, my part-time teaching experience, and my terminal-degree goals. With all that in mind, we then looked at various publications. Another professor in the
department who knew that I was searching for a topic, shared with me a publication in which a nationally recognized leader in my field had written a particular article. The author suggested some twenty areas of needed research. Of the areas he suggested, I saw one that right away attracted me. And that's how the process began. The end result was that the research question that I developed was not the exact question that had been raised in the article, but was similar to it. (Greg)

After my generals I talked with my advisor about the topic. He suggested that I look at people in ______ who have not yet graduated. He recommended that I read certain materials and suggested discussing the topic with several other faculty members he knew. From that my advisor and I identified the topic that I currently have. It was not a very difficult process. I thought it went pretty smoothly. (Yancy)

I was searching for something that would interest me, but just as importantly would be accepted by my advisor. I literally tried five or six topics by going into his office and 'floating' them by. Usually he'd 'shoot them down' by saying, 'That's already been done; that's been done too much; you don't have the expertise to get into that; that's too big; that's too small; who cares.' Finally one day I was sitting around with some friends when the topic of ____ was being discussed. I mentioned the topic to my advisor. He reacted positively and suggested I write something up. Then I submitted it, and he said that it wasn't a bad proposal, but why don't I do it this way. So I did, and he accepted it. It was just as much finding a topic that was acceptable to my advisor as it was finding something that was of interest to me. Now a lot of advisors will deny that they ever do that, but mine did. (Walt)

Question 2: What do you recall from working with your advisor that is significant to you? Why was it important? What made it meaningful?

Most interviewees responded to this question by indicating that their advisor offered expert direction and support. Comments
by Dave and Ben are examples of typical responses:

I remember most vividly the wealth of ideas that he had. He had more ideas than I could shake a stick at. Very supportive. Was quick in terms of reading anything I turned in to him. Making comments. Very helpful in terms of developing the ideas. I had several courses with him on research in terms of coming up with the problems and the questions. So early in my coursework, my advisor had set out the parameters for research with his advisees and followed pretty closely to that. (Dave)

I think the most significant thing is his helping to give me direction. I knew pretty much what I wanted to do, but I needed some input and some clarification. I'm in a little different situation because my advisor is very aware of what doctoral candidates are doing. He likes to keep 'tabs' on what we've done and haven't done, which is good. And we have a seminar generally every two weeks which lasts for a couple of hours, and all his advisees get together, and we discuss the progress we've made since the last seminar, ideas that we have, what we've written up to that point, and he may have somebody come in for example and say, 'I'm thinking of looking at this area and this is the problem statement that I've written out. Would you look at my problem statement and give me some feedback?' The whole process is real helpful. It's not like I'm just 'shooting off in the dark' somewhere. I know what's going on. (Ben)

Xavier thought working with his advisor was significant because the relationship was atypical:

Some people have advisors they've only had one course with, and the bulk of the relationship with that advisor is more of a counselor-client relationship. But it hasn't been that kind of relationship with my advisor. After being in a number of classes with him, we just kind of got on the same wavelength with my program. There wasn't really a need for 'hashing' things out. It was a very smooth kind of thing. So my dissertation consists of being more journalistic than the paper I did for ____.

I need to 'flesh out' the material so that it will be dissertation material. (Xavier)
Four interviewees--Carol, Helen, Janet, and Linda--either did not recall any meaningful, significant experiences or ignored this question. Because of their "nonresponses," to this question, their survey questionnaires were reviewed. The researcher found that Carol, Helen, and Linda has indicated "somewhat dissatisfied" and that Janet had marked "very dissatisfied" to the question concerning degree of satisfaction with their advisor's help on the dissertation. (See page 61.)

**Question 3: What was the role of your advisor in your dissertation experience?**

Kent was frustrated by the one-dimensional role of his advisor. His response to the question was "I would say he helped me to identify and to focus on a problem, to think towards the consequences that I needed to ask in order to achieve my objective." Unfortunately, Kent wanted his advisor to give him personal, as well as professional, support; however, he could not approach his advisor. He did not feel comfortable about calling him and waited several months before he received feedback on his chapters.

Yancy, on the other hand, felt that his advisor offered both professional and personal support:

"My advisor is someone to 'kick me in the butt' once in a while when I need it. He is somebody who helps me get beyond what I initially see in order for me to gather deeper meaning out of it. It's just helpful to talk to him because it makes me think a little more deeply about what I'm seeing and helps me devise my own labels on what that information is. Despite the fact that he has to 'light a fire' under me, I find him to be a support too. I'm very satisfied with my advisor's help; but I'm not"
as satisfied that I'm away from OSU and living in another state and can't get more help. Of course, that's only because of me, not him. (Yancy)

"Consultant," "enabler," "guide," and "preceptor" were the most common descriptors used to illustrate the advisor's role. Dave, Vera, Mark, and Irene describe their advisors in ways that are representative of most positive responses:

Kind of a consultant. He did not direct. He did not tell me what to do. He had a lot of suggestions. He did inform me of things that needed to be done in order to complete the process. He was both good in terms of the process and had ideas on the content and in the overall process of getting the dissertation completed. Not just in these but for all the steps that I needed to do. Who to contact for the computer center. All the forms. He was a good advisor in that sense. Good in procedural things in terms of the whole doctoral program. He was always accessible and available. (Dave)

My advisor stimulates my thoughts in the right direction. I don't think that's just a superficial kind of service to get the dissertation done. I think he has a greater concern for my personal development. I'm a very efficient person and to some extent his emphasis on my personal development I find frustrating from time to time. In the long run, particularly now that I have some 'space' between me and the development of the proposal, I can appreciate his more global approach, as opposed to my rather narrow, more efficient approach. He sees the dissertation as a more developmental experience, and I see it more as an exercise. (Vera)

My advisor was an enabler. He gave me general methodological and conceptual guidance and didn't get in the road. He was very well versed in the literature. He was a sounding board. He was a challenge when I needed that. But it didn't occur frequently. It occurred when I initiated it. When I wanted to see him, he was there for me to see. There was a little bit of both—he was the advisor,
and I was the advisee; but then there were times when we were pretty much equal. He was easy to be candid with--it nudged more in the peer relationship direction than the classic student-teacher relationship. Even before I was finished, we were talking about collaborating on an article. (Mark)

My advisor was a guide, a preceptor. He was a person who was always receptive to whatever I would come to talk to him about. He may not have agreed with my approach, but he would always listen, evaluate it, and give me his opinion or his advice in a constructive manner. He was available. That was important. I knew other people who had difficulty making appointments with professors who had a great many students and who really had to apportion their time more carefully. He kept telling me along the way that I was doing something worthwhile. There were times when I was in the 'slumps,' and he would say 'But this is normal. It's just natural to feel this way. This is just part of the whole system.' He'd been through it with so many dozens of students. His belief in me was unwavering, and he believed that I was doing something important too. (Irene)

Carol and Linda were very dissatisfied with the roles of their advisors since both had expected to have collegial relationships. Their disappointment seemed to heighten their dissatisfaction with their doctoral programs. Opal was the only one of the thirty interviewees who appeared to have a collegial relationship with her advisor:

Extremely unusual. Many of my friends, my colleagues, and my advisor's colleagues,--to put it no other way--are jealous of the relationship. Other students are truly jealous of the relationship. The collegial relationship stemmed out of the fact that he was a good mentor. He is a good mentor--teacher in a sense. He taught me how to share those professional experiences. There's two parts to it: there's the professional level and the personal level. Mentor is the professional level, and
Colleague and friend is the personal level. There's a sharing and a camaraderie that a lot of people wish they had. My dissertation was a 'breeze.' My whole experience was a 'breeze.' The only block I got by my advisor was to stop taking courses. (Opal)

While not a typical response to question three, Stan articulated best the multifaceted roles that a very adroit advisor might play:

One of the primary roles was that of critic, but a very caring critic. My advisor worked really hand-in-hand with me in the best sense of being a mentor. But he did not simply accept every chapter or accept without any revision certain drafts. Another role was that of support agent in terms of directing me to some of the things in the organizational literature, challenging me if certain assumptions didn't 'fit.' He was a personal support because my father died when I was writing final chapters, and my advisor was able to work with me and see me through that without substantial interruptions. (So that was an unusual role he took on.) Also he was a linking agent or someone to bring together various networks and the diverse other faculty on my committee. (Stan)

Question 4: How frequent have your contacts been with your advisor? What has been the climate of your relationship? What are the most significant areas of assistance provided by your advisor?

Advisor availability was considered to be very important to all the interviewees. Only four out of thirty had difficulty scheduling appointments. Helen and Kent indicated that their advisors were difficult to see because they had a large number of advisees. Helen indicated that a typical wait for an appointment was two weeks and that cancellations and "double bookings" were not infrequent. Ironically, Penny had the same advisor as Kent.
While Kent waited several weeks for an appointment and even several months to have rough drafts returned, Penny could be scheduled within a week and had prompt two-week returns on rough drafts.

Carol had a special situation. Her advisor was out of the country shortly after she began writing her dissertation. She was also "pushed" to finish her dissertation because her advisor gave her four-months' notice when she was writing final chapters that he was resigning in June. Doug, who had the same advisor that Carol had but is working with a new advisor now, explained his situation with his former advisor as:

I guess once a month wouldn't be unfair to say. [frequency of meetings] My advisor would often schedule a meeting, and then he would have to cancel because he had forgotten about something else. And when I was in his office, he might schedule thirty minutes to an hour, but I had to figure he was 'running behind,' and he was rushed. Actually the best conversation he ever had really wasn't one, but it was via tape. He would read my draft and then talk into his taperecorder. He might write a few little notes on my papers, but actually his best responses came from his taped messages. But I never really had a one-to-one relationship with him. I wrote a graduate-level course for him, and we did 'touch base' from time to time on that, and I could basically 'drop in' from time to time because I was his TA then. Just before he left the university, he did kind of apologize for not being the kind of advisor he thought he could have been. (Doug)

Amy and Irene, who had the same advisor, felt that they had an advantage in scheduling appointments since their advisor is not burdened with classroom teaching now that he has emeritus standing:

My advisor is retired. He's always there. We'd meet for lunch. It's not real informal, just fairly informal. He's also been very supportive,
but also slightly demanding—but demanding in a good way. 'That's fine. You're doing well. Let's do this too. Or why don't you think of this?' He's pretty much 'signed off' on chapters one and three saying, 'You're doing a good job. That's "great" and so forth.' On chapter two, the literature review, he was very frank with me, 'You've got a lot of literature here, but it's more descriptive; it's not analytical enough.' (Amy)

Most of my conferring with my advisor was either by telephone or getting together with him for lunch about once a month or every six weeks to 'catch' him up to where I was. I called him whenever I needed help or whenever I felt I needed to report in. He made it very obvious that whenever I needed him, that he was available. Since he was an emeritus professor, he was more available as far as time was concerned than some teaching professors would be. It was easy to get an appointment with him usually. I might have to call a week in advance, but often I could get help in just a telephone conversation to take care of something on the 'spot' that didn't need a lot of discussion. (Irene)

Being on campus and having an advisor who is willing to work on dissertation details were advantages from which both Greg and Ben benefited. In Ben's case, even the department office setting lent itself to successfully complementing his dissertation endeavor:

I see my advisor frequently because I'm on campus and the other people who are on my committee are in the same office he's in and see I work pretty closely with them too. So I can't see one really without seeing the other two. All three of them have the same secretary. (Ben)

I worked closely with him every day. Everytime I gave him a draft of a chapter, I would get it back within 24-48 hours. He either would type up comments concerning the draft, or he would taperecord comments. At the beginning a couple of times he taped his comments because the draft was so poor, and he was so frustrated. Also near the end of the dissertation he did that. I was
in tears over a tape he made in early June because he said, 'You're working hard and making progress, but I don't think you can "make" your August goal of finishing. I'm willing to do everything I can to help you, but I just don't think you're going to be able to "make" it.' It took me an hour and a half to compose myself, and then he called me and asked if I was ready to talk. I said, 'Yes.' So I went to his office, and we closed the door, and we had a long talk. He simply said, 'Here's what you are going to have to do in the next four weeks. I said that I wanted to try. He said that if I was willing to work eighteen hours a day and turn in things everyday, then he would be willing to work with me. (Greg)

Climate and personality "mix" were important to Roger and Neil in fostering meaningful relationships with their advisors:

The climate has been positive and supportive--not intimidating. It's rather 'open,' because I could ask any questions I wanted to and I knew that he would do his best to give me a response. That was easy because of his availability. I've always been able to get an appointment, if I had to have one in a hurry. It was generally the same day or the next day and always within three days. One of the reasons which lead me to ask for him as my advisor when I came into the program was that I knew that he was a very faithful committee member and a very helpful advisor. I knew his reputation, so I requested him after I had been assigned a temporary advisor. (Neil)

It was a very comfortable relationship--one where I felt very much at ease saying what I felt. And I usually do anyway. But I was comfortable with my advisor and that helped. That was one less roadblock. I don't think the dissertation would have gone as smoothly if I had 'stuck' with my generals advisor because he needs much more to be in control. There was a free-flow with my advisor. Whenever I got 'fed up' with the place, I could go in and scream and yell at him, and he'd say, 'Now that you've got that over with--fine. Now go back to work.' My advisor could handle me and could give me free rein. I think that finding that personality 'mix' is real important. (Roger)
Both Amy and Vera found meaning in working with a dissertation support group. Although the professor who organized the group was not Amy's advisor, he was Vera's advisor. Vera described her advisor's assistance as follows:

My advisor created a dissertation support group composed of all the students who were his advisees. And he would meet regularly with us. He was one of us. He would present his ideas, and we would react; then we would present our ideas, and everyone would react. So it was an opportunity to field test proposals and ways of thinking about topics. I appreciated my advisor's participation as a peer, as opposed to someone with control. My advisor is more of a philosopher. He couldn't even answer questions about footnotes. He would focus more on the philosophy as it would influence topic choice, and the approach to take for its defense--whether that be a library-based dissertation or a quantitative research design. (Vera)

While Carol, Doug, Helen, Janet, Kent, and Linda could not articulate any particularly significant areas of assistance provided by their advisor, Walt found everything to be significant:

My God! Thousands of things were significant! It was a love-hate relationship. Everyone warned me that my advisor was a real 'hard ass,' and he was a mean man. That didn't 'fit' what I remembered of my interview with him. I thought he was a very nice man. So I decided I was going to make up my own mind on this one. I remember him not ever giving me a 'break.' Any time I would ever come in with anything that was half prepared, he would send me packing, and would hardly talk to me. So he really 'pushed' me to the limit in every respect that I can remember. My whole life--my whole career--was controlled by this man. (Walt)
Question 5: Have you been satisfied with the extent of help your advisor has given you? Why? Can you offer any comments that would indicate areas in which you were dissatisfied or areas of particular satisfaction?

Eve, Anita, Janet, and Kent expressed frustrations because the help they received from their advisors did not meet their expectations:

My advisor had a weakness in knowledge of research design that I did; his research experience is more descriptive. Also he was not as knowledgeable in statistical analysis. He was good for procedural matters. He was very humanistic. If I'd get 'down in the dumps' and worry about never finishing this thing and be an ABD, he'd always be there to give me some support. (Eve)

The dissertation phase was very frustrating. I knew on the one hand that I had to be the one to make the decisions; and yet on the other hand, I felt that I had no direction from anybody. I could use this test or that test and either one would be fine with my advisor and the committee. Yet I had a sense that one test really would be better for these data. I had taken two courses in statistics, and done well in both of them. Yet I felt that statistics was my weakest area. My advisor always conveyed a confidence in my abilities and supported me as an individual. Yet I wish I would have had him say, 'You need to do...' or 'You haven't attended to this.' He didn't perceive deficits there. Perhaps it would have helped if I had designed the committee differently. (Anita)

Although my proposal was 'turned down' the first time, I did not have any help in how I would alter it, and this annoyed me. I had some vague ideas on how I should go. But the next thing I understood was that I shouldn't come back until I had the proposal rewritten in final form. After the first proposal turndown, I actually paid a research designer to look over how I was going to analyze things. I paid a designer for what I should have gotten from my advisor, and I don't think that was fair. Since I realized that I wasn't going to get any help from my advisor (and absolutely no help from my other committee members), I took courses in multivariate analysis, loglinear analysis, and
multiple regression. I also hired a statistician to evaluate my statistical design. Again, where I should have gotten assistance from my advisor and my committee members, I didn't in both the research design and the statistical component. I felt so insecure and defensive that only my husband knew that I had scheduled my oral defense. (Janet)

I am not satisfied with the use that I made of my advisor. There were times when I was going through severe mental anguish and agony. I should have probably made some appointments to talk with him. He never 'turned me down.' But then again the message was often communicated to me--not explicitly--that there were other persons to be seen, and I knew that. So I was reluctant. I don't know if I could have taken greater access to the comfort of his office. (Kent)

Carol and Linda pointed out disappointments they encountered in finding their advisor experiences lacked collegial-peer relationships:

It seemed that one one level I had to play the adult, knowledgeable professor role--a collegial role. While on another level, I was just a student; and the difference between those two roles was unsettling to me because I wasn't ever sure which I was expected to be. Also I felt that I'd been an adult when I went into the program--I had adult responsibilities, was married, owned a house, had a job, was on the boards of several associations, had spoken a lot.... (Carol)

They claim that when you're accepted into the doctoral program that there is a type of peer relationship, but I don't see that. I view it as the old student-teacher traditional model. You 'play the game' and get out of here. I think that's unfortunate. I would say my advisor has grown a lot in the last few years, but I think he is not very familiar with women in the particular area that I'm in. I elected my advisor. I also knew his power status, and I knew that when it came to the defense that if I got that far, that I'd be fine because
my advisor would never let a student of his get
to that point and not make sure he/she would get
out. I selected him, and I knew inherently some
of our personality differences. I think we grew
to have a mutual respect, but we still have
personality differences. (Linda)

Walt reported feeling intimidated by his advisor, unpleasant
at the time, but later understood:

The hate part of the love-hate relationship
between my advisor and me, while useful, was
certainly not pleasant. I think the tactics
that he used were effective, but very unpleasant.
They varied from time to time—condescending,
certainly intimidating, always frustrating.
But they worked. He knew what buttons to push
to get me to do the best I could do. It's only
in retrospect I understand it—and I do. I
acknowledge it. (Walt)

Question 6: How has your advisor been of particular
assistance in readying material for committee review?
In proceeding with the dissertation? In preparing
for orals?

The responses to question six overlapped with other questions.
An issue of particular interest which evolved from question six
related to paperwork. Dissertation paperwork was an area of great
concern to Faith, Zane, and Brenda. In each instance, their
respective advisors effected a different approach. Faith, for
example, employed a statistical expert. Zane worked closely with
his advisor right down to the hours before the defense. Brenda's
advisor was non-directive except for substantial help on the impli-
cations section.

My advisor told me that you don't necessarily
have to know everything there is about statistics
in order to do any kind of dissertation because
what you're going to do is find somebody who really is an expert in that field and have him help you--which is what I did. That was probably the best advice that my advisor ever gave me. I didn't know that I was going to find the person that I did. He has a real interest in my topic, and now we are co-authoring some articles that are derived from my dissertation study. (Faith)

My advisor wouldn't let me show the drafts of my dissertation to the rest of the committee until he felt it was really in good shape, so that it wouldn't have to go through any more reviews. He helped me prepare for my oral defense by trying to relax me. He had me come in for lunch several hours before the defense, mainly to calm me down. He didn't have any strategy in mind other than to calm me down. (Zane)

My dissertation advisor was also my program advisor, so I knew his style was non-directive. One thing about him that I found frustrating was that he is not detail oriented for bureaucratic paperwork. But my advisor served a different function. We had a good relationship. He is extremely philosophical, and he was particularly helpful on a suggestion for the last chapter of the dissertation--the implications section. I expressly chose my other committee members to 'balance' with my advisor. (Brenda)

Question 7: Did you receive significant help from persons other than your major advisor? What particular help did you receive from members of your reading committee? Did anyone else help in the development of your dissertation? In what manner and to what extent?

The doctoral committee offered substantial help to Penny and Roger:

I had a high-powered committee. They were the masters. They had what I wanted to know. My advisor was a professor--very exacting, a perfectionist, a confidence builder. He knew when to be firm, when to set limits, and when to withdraw. He was a thorough editor. My second committee person was a therapist for
me. I had so much trust in him and my advisor. The third member and another professor helped me with the statistics. I also had a friend who knew somebody who could run the computer for me. I was on their doorsteps over Christmas and got to know all their families. (Penny)

Committee members helped primarily by synthesizing and focusing. They got me to take what was in my mind and put it on paper. Some good suggestions and some that were not so worthwhile were made. It took me two or three drafts to realize that if I didn't change something and it came back to them a second time, that it was not an 'issue.' Or I could say, 'I see what your point is, but I don't think that's important here.' (Roger)

Ursula felt, aside from her advisor and her committee, that she was on her own, except for supportive help from her husband:

Other than help from my advisor and committee members, I was more or less by myself working. There was no one in the school district to discuss it with. I didn't have contact with other graduate students because I wasn't on campus. I got a lot of support from my husband who has a Ph.D. also. (I typed his dissertation years ago.) Without his support I could have 'dumped' it really easily—and 'chucked' the whole process. I would often get very frustrated and say, 'I'm going to quit.' And he'd pour a glass of wine. On weekends he would take the baby and leave the house for four or five hours until the baby's naptime. I'd have the house quiet; I unplugged the phone; I put a sign on the door, 'Do not disturb.' Since I worked full time, weekends were the best times, and that's why it took so long—nearly seven years. Our social life went to zero. I spent my whole weekend working on that dissertation. (Ursula)

Dave, Zane, and Xavier, respectively, found help from a statistical consultant, a department chairperson, and an administrator:
I got major help from a statistical consultant. In fact without him, I'm not sure what I would have done. (Dave)

I got help from the department chairperson at the university where I teach. I used him as a sounding board. Also I'm not the world's best writer, so I hired a consultant--a person in my department at the university--to read my drafts and indicate parts in the writing that weren't clear. I told my advisor that I had taken on a person to help, and he seemed pleased with that idea. (Zane)

I made contact with an administrator who was going to head up the state program, and he gave me entry to the agencies and institutions that I wanted to study. He was very receptive, and I had several good conversations with him. I had done a lot of reading, and he saw me as a good resource; we 'picked' each other's brains. I became an informal member of that program as it developed. He was very valuable, although I was not officially a member of that program. (Xavier)

Group support was substantial and significant to Roger, Ben, and Amy:

That winter quarter, and I guess I was somewhat responsible, several of us got together and said, 'You know we're not working as hard as we ought to and nobody is going to push us unless we push ourselves.' It was my finding with most of the people in the doctoral stage that there's thousands of people out there who will say, 'Oh, you'll do this when you're ready.' And there aren't a lot of people to say, 'Well, you get your ass in gear.' We were close enough friends--we had gone through core courses together--that we decided that we would schedule a meeting. We devoted two hours a week--no excuses, no 'cuts.' On our own--a group of probably six or eight of us--put one another on the 'spot.' People were responsible for certain days to present--even with only two or three pages--to get support, response, and occasional kicks. (Roger)

I got some help from the advisee group in terms of trying to 'iron out' some ideas for starting and setting up the design. But more than that
I tried to take the initiative myself because I feel like it's my dissertation, and it's my responsibility to do it. (Ben)

What really helped me was the support group a professor who is neither my advisor nor is on my committee has formed. Members said I was really 'hyper' about my upcoming oral defense and helped me relax. One woman in the group introduced me to the word processor. It's free. It's just wonderful. Another woman in the group is a 'super' person and friend that I could 'bounce' ideas off. Friends early on have been more important than my advisor because I didn't go to him until I had something intelligent--something substantive to say. (Amy)

Question 8: What do you consider to be your least satisfying experience as a doctoral candidate? Your most satisfying experience?

Frustrations or satisfactions elicited a voluble flow of commentary. For example, in dissertations where statistics were paramount, Ben and Ursula found substantial frustrations in coping with entering the computer world:

I had to write the program for the stupid thing. It took me longer to write up that stupid program than it did to do my review of the literature and write the proposal and have my committee meeting, revise it, and write it over. That's been the absolutely, the most negative thing about this whole dissertation. But what I didn't know how to do was to take the raw data and punch the cards and put the cards in what order to get the printout. When I walked off the elevator, whooppe! What do you do? Does that go in column two or was that supposed to be in column eighteen of your card and did you leave a comma out of column fifty-six? It doesn't 'run.' I got an SAS manual. There is one statistical consultant, and he is there two or three hours a day. So you write this stuff up and then you go down there, and it doesn't 'run.' I would get in line the first hour behind eight other people and see the consultant the
last fifteen minutes, and he's say, 'You need to put this card in and repunch the card and put a comma in column sixteen.' And then it would 'run.' So then I'd have another error and couldn't figure out what it was, and then I'd wait until the next day and go through the same process again. It's stupid. They've got a million-dollar computer down there.... (Ben)

Yes, that was the computer room. That was the most horrible experience I've ever had in my whole life. I went up there and tried to get a deck of cards for a computer printout. I stood in line waiting for this person who was supposed to show me how to do that. There were three people ahead of me, and I waited for an hour and a half. I don't mind waiting if I'm going to get some help that is direct and get it right in the way it's supposed to be. But I have never seen such a mess in my life. Trying to run the machine, I got very frustrated. There's directions on the walls, but I was afraid maybe I'd lose the data I had. The guy who was supposed to help wasn't very friendly or sympathetic. I was scared about the whole process. I went out and hired a statistician. Getting a paper with a bunch of little squares--that drove me 'up the wall.'

(Ursula)

Self-satisfactions arising from the dissertation were expressed by Carol, Doug, Faith, and Xavier for a variety of reasons:

There was an interest that I brought with me that I explored, that I defined, and that I learned about. My dissertation supported a lot of the hunches and directions that I had taken as a teacher. The dissertation was a confirming. (Carol)

A member of my committee wrote: Doug--Glad to see you're really moving along. What happened between the time you wrote your general exam and this draft? As I recall, your writing on the general exam was very weak. This text here is excellent. (Doug)

The best part for me was the first year I was at OSU when I spent all of my time--and I mean all of my time--in the library. And I read everything that every professor had on every closed reserve list. Every word of it I read. You could go into the library any hour of the day or night it was
open, and you could find me sitting there someplace in a little cubicle reading. And when I think about it, I had the most wonderful time doing that. I'm not sure exactly why. But I really did. I didn't have to work other than as a GA. But the rest of the time I really--I just really wanted to do it and enjoyed it thoroughly. (Faith)

I enjoyed the coursework the most. The interaction with other quality students I was fortunate enough to be in classes with, the fine professors, and the stimulating discussions. I took over 200 quarter hours, and I only had three or four courses that I didn't think were that worthwhile and that I didn't enjoy. (Xavier)

Frustration, however, for Greg was closely linked to the economics of a sabbatical, as well as the actual effort required to complete his program:

The most frustrating thing was to have gone into the program--and I guess this is true for everyone or nearly everyone--not really knowing the amount of work, the time, the energy, the sacrifices, the money. I figure with my loans and my refinancing of my house--even with the double TA--it cost me in those two years in lost earnings $30,000. (Greg)

Interpersonal contacts experienced by Helen, Opal, Quina, and Walt were reported as satisfying and memorable:

My most satisfying experience was having the interviews with the women in my study. The experience was very enriching and extremely satisfying. I felt very privileged for them to allow me to share their life experiences and to share with me what was very significant to them. (Helen)

My most satisfying experience was the one-on-one relationship with my advisor and the co-teaching with a committee member. (Opal)
My most satisfying experience was working with the administrators who were the subject of my dissertation. It was really fun, and they learned some things about themselves as a result of our conversations. And I think I made a fairly significant contribution to the literature in terms of what emerged out of the findings. I think the administrators were pleased with that. They learned that they have a lot of control, based on their personalities, of what goes on in their institutions. It was exciting because I was putting something into the situation. I involved them in all phases of the study, and it's been their study as much as it was mine. I was the catalyst or the conduit. And they built up a trust with me. (Quina)

My most satisfying experience was my relationship with a certain administrator under whom I worked. He was my confidant—the only one I could talk to about my advisor. He will always be my big brother and father figure who has guided me through many 'tough' times. Most of the time he was my mentor, the father more than the brother. I mean mentor in the classical definition. He had established himself well enough in the field and in the university to be able to afford to take on somebody like me and let me make mistakes and not fear any kind of retribution for it. My eventual relationship with my advisor when my doctoral work was finished was equally satisfying. I had successfully negotiated the rites of passage; therefore I was worthy of being called colleague. And it was perfectly clear that the moment my advisor walked out there after my oral defense and extended his hand, that he was extending more than, 'Congratulations! You have passed this test.' It was, 'Congratulations! You have run the gauntlet, and you have survived!' (Walt)

Both Vera and Roger emphasized satisfactions arising from peer groups:

The most satisfying experience for me was being in the advisee-support group. I felt that the group was supportive of me, and it was a journey that we were all on together, and we were all covering the same trails, and we could compare notes and talk together in the same jargon. Now that I'm out here, living in another state, I find I sorely miss that group. And I don't know that
my advisor was really the key person in the group, but he made the group possible. He would call us together and then just sort of step into the background. The people who were with me in the program were all very dynamic people. Just being with them was a real opportunity. It was an education in and of itself. (Vera)

The most satisfying experience had to be the group experience. We had a good group of people. We learned a good deal from one another—much more outside the classroom. We did study-group routines, and we drank a lot and ran together and ate ice cream or whatever. There was a real body of people that came out of that experience and that was probably the highlight. I think I learned more from my peers than from my advisor. (Roger)

Various aspects of dissatisfaction with coursework were reflected in Roger's comments:

I was disappointed in the quality of the course and the quality of instruction. The courses were significantly less demanding than my pre-doctoral courses. (Roger)

The death of an advisor caused problems for Stan until he found an adequate replacement. Stan, moreover, reported dissatisfaction with some committee members, including one whom he believed did not read his chapters:

My first advisor died and caused me some trauma in readjusting my thinking about what my research would be and in selecting a new advisor. It's ironic, however, because I think things worked out better for me in terms of my research, and the direction I got with my second advisor. A secondary dissatisfaction would be the varying degrees of interest and input by other committee members. At times they were extraordinarily good, but at times they were extraordinarily complacent. I would say one member probably didn't read my chapters. (Stan)
Mark's extensive comments emphasized many of his frustrations and individual disquietudes, which were reflected in general dissatisfactions with the overall dissertation process:

Despite the fact that I came to OSU feeling good about my abilities, I still had the perception that I would be getting help from experts in the field. And I was looking for some of that. It gets disappointing sometimes to turn in papers for courses in which no remarks are made--just a grade. It's nice to know I got an 'A,' but I also wondered if I put page 14 in upside down, if anybody would 'catch' it. They didn't say, 'Well, you're off base here or you're on base there,' or 'Generally good, but what about these points? I think even though I'm capable, I was hoping for more feedback. Even on the dissertation I kind of got the feeling that all of my committee members didn't read my stuff as hard as I would have liked them to read it. Maybe that's because they had faith that I was going to do a good job. Maybe they were pressed with seven other dissertations. One committee member wrote some copious marginal notes. The other two committee members never gave me a lot of that type of feedback. In general I didn't feel in my coursework that the written work was scrutinized enough, and in my dissertation the same holds true--but not quite. (Mark)

Kent indicated that topic selection presented problems: "My least satisfying experience was taking the leap from the completion of the coursework and the general examination into finding a topic for my dissertation."

Anita found a "lack of intellectual rigor" on the part of the faculty. Linda said she looked at the "whole thing" as the "best and worst of times," but felt that she had learned a lot. Their respective comments are worth noting:
I experienced significant disappointment in the lack of intellectual rigor on the part of the faculty. I'll be in a position to teach doctoral students, and I'm very aware that doctoral students need intellectual challenge. You can't be talking about 'soft fuzzies' and experiential knowledge of ten years ago. There should be more peer review among faculty. On the one hand, finding that I knew more than a faculty member can be very reassuring; but at the same time, it was frustrating. I want to know what they know. I know what I know. (Anita)

I look at that whole thing as the best and worst of times--my advisor, my committee members, my fellow doctoral students. I've said for a long time that I was tired. If I'd known what I was getting into, I'd never start again. But now that I have a little more perspective, I would say it was definitely the best and worst of times. It was definitely a political process just like everything else--you have to 'play the game.' I grew; I've learned a lot. I was exposed to a lot that I never would have been exposed to. (Linda)

General examinations were the least satisfying experiences for Amy, Faith, Helen, Penny, Quina, and Walt, all of whom underwent physical or emotional reactions. The oral defense, as well, received sharp criticism from Dave, who felt that it was a "waste of time":

I think the defense was a waste of time--their time and my time. Nothing came of it, but that might be because I had worked with the committee step-by-step, so everything was always approved by the members. The more I think about it, the defense was not necessary. There may be other cases. [What do you think the purpose of the defense is in the first place?] I have no idea except to say everything is done, and we all give our approval to it, and we congratulate you. You've finished the process. (Dave)
Question 9: Do you believe your dissertation experience has prepared you for future research? Do you intend to write on topics related to your dissertation? If yes, in either case explain.

Several interviewees emphasized they believed the dissertation experience had prepared them for future research. Comments made by Neil and Stan emphasized their interest in further work. Trent received added incentive when his advisor nominated his dissertation for an award. Faith became involved in departmental research which enabled her to find new perspective. Zane and Clark both viewed the process in retrospect and admitted they now recognized a new value in their dissertations which they had not appreciated earlier. All these comments are presented below:

Yes, it's prepared me for future research. It's gotten me enough into the area to see all sorts of things that are interesting to me that I want to follow up on. It's also given me a background to evaluate what I'm reading. Absolutely I intend to write on topics related to it. I've already written in AERA, and I have an interest in AAHE and AAUP. I'd also like to write a book on the subject. (Neil)

It prepared me for the application of my research to my day-to-day life as a particular type of administrator. I have also used that research to do presentations and papers at national conferences. I've also participated with my research subjects. Perhaps one of my greatest disappointments is that I haven't published any articles yet. (Stan)

My advisor nominated my dissertation for an award. It was named 'outstanding,' because of the novelty--there had never been anything like this done before; because the design was adequate; and because the application was there--I'm now forecasting and showing trends for the state legislature. I have also published articles
on the topic in an Ohio journal and a national journal. Also I was interviewed in a newsletter. Recently I've been asked to write book reviews for publications related to my topic area. (Trent)

While I was writing the dissertation, I didn't think it was preparing me for future research. Now, yes I do because I've been involved in several of the research studies for the department as part of my job, and I understand a lot of things real well that I never understood before. And I understand where I can go on campus to get help with those things that I don't understand. I've had some wonderful ideas about how to get things analyzed, and so it really was helpful. Probably six months ago I wouldn't have known that it would be, but it really is now. (Faith)

Most meaningful was the fact that one can focus in on a subject that would be of general interest and work it into something of value. I realize a lot of dissertations that you study look 'rinky dink,' but at the time it just was fun to make a 'baby!' They let me create it out of nothing. Now I'm working with another professor at the university where I teach. I'm using the topic idea, but expanding it to meet the needs of my department. (Zane)

Yeah. I kind of enjoyed it as a matter of fact. I don't think my research was all that 'great,' that significant, or earth shattering. But I kind of enjoyed the whole process. I didn't mind that part of the dissertation at all. As I said, I took my time doing it. If I ever got tired of it, I just set it down and let it go for several months sometimes and pick it back up again. I had a survey and did interviews. I enjoyed the whole thing--putting it together, the endless computer runs. It was a challenge. I had no idea what the outcome of the research was going to be. I had some surprises on what I found. (Clark)
Question 10: If you were to start your doctoral work again, what would you do differently?

Interviewees responded in a variety of ways when asked what they might have done differently had they had the opportunity. Some believed the residency requirements onerous. Some felt they should have expended continuous effort to complete their requirements all at one time, rather than delay their dissertations. Some felt that vocationally their objective of a Ph.D. might have been too idealistic or unrealistic to the extent an MBA specialty might have opened doors to acceptable careers.

In specific comments culled from interviews, an antagonism toward the core course residency requirements is reflected in the statements made by both Clark and Brenda:

Although there is a residence requirement for taking core courses, in the ideal situation I would have done the coursework while I was working; and then I would have 'taken off' a year to write the dissertation. (Brenda)

I didn't like the residency requirement for core courses. I didn't go for that at all. I suppose it's another monkeybar you have to negotiate. I didn't think it was that necessary to devote that much time to and that much sacrifice. When I served my residency, I brought my whole family to Columbus. And I don't think I'd go through that again. In fact, I could have gone to another state university where my wife works. And I could have gone there without a residency at all--it could have been arranged. But I had already received two other degrees from there, and I thought, 'Nah! Pay the dues.' I was pretty idealistic, but I tell you, that idealism evaporates! (Clark)
Stan related that perhaps he would have liked to pursue extra courses outside his selected field for the benefit of an improved overall perspective:

I purposely chose OSU for the freedom given both in the coursework and the research for the dissertation. I'm fairly self driven; but I think even for someone who is highly motivated, I might have tried to conceptualize my research earlier on. But I guess there is a certain readiness. You can't force that. The only other thing that I might have done differently is to venture out more and take some courses in some different areas--maybe be more playful in my coursework. People talked about terrific professors in agriculture and administrative science. Or I could have taken an accounting course. I just wish I would have been a little bit more playful. (Stan)

Doug, Eve, and Vera advocated an acceleration of the dissertation time schedule:

I would like to have had the dissertation progress more quickly. I should have concentrated more and 'put my nose to the grindstone,' and tried to forget about being a person and forsaking all else, I should have pursued it day and night. (Doug)

If I had it to do over again, I'd have quit work and done it in a shorter period of time. I took me seven years, so it was a 'drag' that way. (Eve)

I might stay and finish the dissertation. But I figured the doctoral work had already cost me $60,000 in foregone income, and I just couldn't 'put up' with another year of that, so I left. And I've been away since 1980, and I plan to finish up this year. But it's been a bit of an albatross around my neck for the last three years. I haven't been doing that much on it, but it haunts me. And I could have delivered myself from that by just staying on an extra year and finishing the thing. And I'm not adamant about doing it another way had I the chance to
do it over again. But if I were giving advice to someone else, I probably would advise that person to stay on. (Vera)

Doubts concerning the time and marketability of the Ph.D. degree were expressed by Kent and Yancy:

I would have done things differently even before I started my doctoral work. After I finished my Master's degree, I would have taught for three years because now that I have my doctorate, most of the jobs that I have considered require such experience. (Kent)

The one thing I'd do differently is to give more focus during my program on what I want to be because I lost focus when I was going through my program. That was because my focus was on school and my assistantship. It wasn't on my life. Maybe it was because I was at an age where exploring was still possible. It was easy to still feel like a student, not a professional who is going back to school and remaining a professional. I lost my identity as being a professional. I worked in a dorm with undergraduates, I felt fairly young, so I became a student again. (Yancy)

Anita and Quina said they both felt in retrospect that some opportunities for smoother progress in the doctoral process had been missed by their lack of sufficient knowledge of specific dissertation techniques and requirements:

I'd ask more questions of people who have gone through the doctoral experience. What problems were there with your dissertation? How did you put your committee together? It seems to me that the committee serves an entirely different function for course advisement and general exams than it does for the dissertation. Perhaps the dissertation committee must be entirely different for a candidate who is at different stages. But that's just not the norm. Very infrequently do committees change. The norm is to have the same
advisor. Certainly very few people make advisor changes. (Anita)

I'd work more closely with my committee--chapter by chapter--out of respect for them. It wasn't until after my defense, and I had had a long conversation with my advisor's wife. She just happened to drop a couple of hints that her husband would have liked to have been more involved in the process--not that I did anything wrong. It's just that over the years he has come to expect that. And that was one thing that I guess I didn't realize and take into consideration. It's not just an issue of my wanting to work independently, but it's also an issue that I should have considered their feelings. (Quina)

Finally, Ben and Penny commented that they probably would have done it the same way all over again, with only perhaps a little different perspective:

I don't know. I'd probably do the same thing. To me, it's been fun. I have a different attitude probably from those other people you're going to interview. I want to get out in the 'real' world and make my life. I don't feel as though my life has started yet. I'm tired of living in a multipurpose room. I want a house. I want a real check. I want a real job. See those people think there's supposed to be some type of big charisma that goes with this degree--some type of big influence. Well to me it's just a continuation of my education. Most of the people I know who are going through the doctoral program, don't really like it. It's more like a drudgery that they're doing, and they don't know why they're doing it. I like the stimulation of learning; I think it's fun! I think it's supposed to be a learning experience and a good experience. It should be a good experience for my advisor, the people on my committee. These people that I see--for them, it's just one big major problem. They have a battle here; another battle over there. I don't see anything wrong with learning for learning's sake. I'm a real planner, and I work stuff out with a lot of detail. It works for me. No matter what your area, it's still a sequence of steps. (Ben)
I'd do it all over exactly as I did it before because it was a 'great' experience, and I gained something. (Penny)

**Thematic Summary**

The following themes emerged from the questionnaire and interview analyses of this study:

**Advisor as support.** Satisfaction with the doctoral program, particularly the dissertation experience, directly relates to the advisee's satisfaction with his/her advisor; thus the advisor is the key person in the dissertation endeavor. Whether the advisor has basically no influence, some influence, or major influence on the dissertation topic selections, the completed dissertation is dependent upon the research refinement which the advisor approves. In fact, in some cases, the advisor may be the only one to see the drafts until he is satisfied that they will meet with the committee's approval.

**Committee as support.** Degree of satisfaction with dissertation committee members was, in most cases, the second most significant element that influenced interviewee satisfaction with the dissertation experience. In some cases the committee members are extremely important in the dissertation process; however, some committee members do not actually read drafts closely, if at all. Their assistance may be strictly supportive.

**Significant others as support.** Professional consultants, such as computer specialists, statistical and research designers, and editors may aid the doctoral student. Peers and graduate
school friends, especially those in support groups, are sometimes helpful. Colleagues and work associates also may offer assistance. Spouses, although mentioned by only three out of 170 respondents on the survey questionnaire, turned out to be helpful for ten out of the thirty interviewees.

**Dissertation writing frustration.** No dissertation is without its problems. While Opal was able to write her data analysis in three days, she had difficulty in refining her topic. Faith wrote her chapters in five weeks; however, she had to revise each chapter several times. Often the study will change and a number of sections will have to be entirely rewritten to accommodate the alterations. Eve had to wait over eight months to complete her study because she could not get enough subjects to test. Doctoral students need to realize that every dissertation will have certain problems.

**General and final oral examination malaisia.** There is a common element of difficulty for the majority of doctoral students in this study who took their examinations. *Malaisia* was the term used to describe the emotional and physical reactions to these "rites of passage."

Walt lost weight, had all the symptoms of influenza, and could not sleep; Helen could not sleep and could only drink orange juice; Faith had an hysterical crying episode the night before and had her first and only migraine headache the first day of writing and had to resort to pills; Penny had dry heaves and shakes; afterwards Neil could not touch a book for a month; Irene was depressed for
several months; Kent repressed the whole thing until he was inter­
viewed; Zane found that he went from a high pitch to depression.

Ursula, who had prepared for the general exam for months by
writing questions each day from slips of paper she had collected in
a fishbowl, described the first day of writing her generals as her
"scariest" experience because after an hour of writing in a room that
was "like a pit," [auditorium of the law school] a girl got up,
screamed, and had a nervous breakdown. [It was the second time that
girl had attempted to take the written examination.] When Ursula saw
the empty chair in front of her the second day, she wondered if that
might happen to her. Roger suffered some anxiety when he was given
the third-day questions on the second day of the exam. Opal, who
described her dissertation to be a "breeze," put off entering the
doctoral program for two years because she was worried about the oral
part of the general examination. Greg and his advisor didn't know it
at the time, but they found out later than the graduate representative
had been "picking at" Greg during the oral defense because the third
member of the dissertation committee had served on a committee the
year before that had recommended that the chairperson of a department
[now the graduate representative] should be demoted.

Amy, Faith, Helen, Kent, Penny, Quina, and Walt said that
the general examination was the least satisfying experience in
graduate school. Janet was so worried that she might fail her
final oral examination, that she "didn't tell a soul" that it was
scheduled. Several interviewees experienced a depression or slump
after the final oral examination.
Irene, who had a comprehensive exam, was more positive about her experience; however, she wanted to recommend that graduate students should not have to serve refreshments to the committee.

Not all found the "rites of passage" to be negative experiences. In fact, those who had problems with the general exams sometimes had positive experiences with the final oral exam.

Conflict of expectations. Dissatisfaction with the advisor seemed to be linked with expectation-reality discrepancy (ERD). This researcher observed that ERD and dissatisfaction with the advisor appeared more in interviews with women than men. Carol, Janet, and Linda were very dissatisfied because their advisors maintained with them what the females considered to be either a teacher-pupil or a master-apprentice relationship. Each, on the other hand, had expected to have a colleague-colleague relationship.

Another area of conflict occurred with expectations concerning programs. Although he had read the catalogue and had interviewed with the department chair, Mark was disappointed after he entered the program and found that only one professor in the department was really a specialist in the area. Quina was also disappointed in her program after she started taking courses from professors in her specialization. Helen was angry when she found that her advisor "didn't care" about helping her find employment after she graduated. Mark in particular felt that he had not been provided with enough information about the program before he decided to attend The Ohio State University.
Some students expected to have more guidance on the writing of their dissertations than they received. Brenda, Faith, Helen, Janet, and Neil found that they relied heavily on certain books to help them with their dissertation endeavors. Several were sorry that no one had told them about these books and hoped that future doctoral students would profit from knowing about these resources. (See Appendix F for a compilation of books they recommended.)

**Special problems of women students.** Ten of the fifteen women interviewees, about 66 percent, appeared to have special problems and/or they perceived their doctoral experiences differently from the fifteen male interviewees. Expectation-reality discrepancy (ERD), previously cited, which particularly related to collegiality relationships with the advisor, was mentioned by Carol, Janet, and Linda. ERD resulted in dissatisfaction with the advisor for these three interviewees.

Other special problems faced by women in this study included situational and psychological obstacles. Time management was often mentioned by women as being a major problem for completing their dissertations. Those who were married and worked full time perceived their situations to be even more intensified. During the course of the interview, a majority of women interviewees described the time they were required to spend on personal and domestic tasks. Under domestic tasks some specified child care as important and time-consuming. Eve and Ursula were two in particular who mentioned child care.

Psychological obstacles resulted in two sub-categories: (1) commitment priority and (2) psychological-ecological "space."
Women perceived that commitment priority was a terrific struggle and an absolute necessity. Commitment priority included giving the dissertation endeavor precedence in time and importance, disengaging from relationships and activities which were not supportive of the dissertation, and making the dissertation the focus of concerted effort. Perceptions concerning commitment priority were not articulated as intensely, if at all, by the majority of male interviewees.

Psychological-ecological "space" appeared to present problems for seven out of fifteen interviewees. Ability to maintain a systematic, ongoing rhythm-and-flow for dissertation planning, organizing, and writing was difficult for Amy, Carol, Helen, Irene, Linda, Penny, and Ursula because they did not keep their dissertation materials in a private, isolated area; instead, six worked at dining room tables and the seventh worked on a couch/coffee table area. These arrangements did not "free" them from the "mainstream" of their home environments. Ursula and Carol mentioned that they had to transport all their dissertation materials to other locations whenever formal meals were served in the dining room.

Eve, Helen, Janet, Linda, Quina, and Ursula are married to professionals. Four of them have husbands with Ph.D. degrees. At least three out of the four husbands are graduate school advisors and thus have a realistic perspective concerning the dissertation process. Amy and Carol have husbands that were not very supportive until they were well into their dissertation writing. Amy was able to get her early support from several close women friends who were members of a dissertation support group that a professor in her academic area
organized.

Eve has a preschool-age child; Ursula, a preschool-age child and a baby only a few months old. At the time they took their generals, they both had a baby--their first--who was under a year old.

From these examples it appears that women definitely perceived that they are confronted with special situational and psychological obstacles when they enter doctoral programs.

Eve represents one interviewee who overcame those obstacles and continued her scholarly endeavors. After completing her doctorate over a year ago, she has published a book on a topic related to her dissertation. Both commitment priority and psychological-ecological "space" have been important elements contributing to her success. Also she attributes her success in part to the support that her husband has given her. Eve describes her husband as:

...extremely active in the parenting role. He's been from the moment our child was born and still is. In fact, I think it's like a 60-40 percentage. He puts her to bed and bathes her. And he's always been extremely active in taking care of her. In my situation, it's fine for me after dinner to go upstairs and work on the book I'm writing. With this book, up until a couple of weeks ago, he's been doing all the cooking, clearing up the table and everything. I just go upstairs and write in my workroom. I've been working sixteen hours a day to try to get the book out. And he's been tolerating that. He says, 'You've got to get that off your back.'

Kismetic moments. This phrase was coined by the researcher and was derived from the Turkish word qismet, meaning "fate or destiny." Kismetic moments described by interviewees added richness to the study and usually represented a meaningful turning point in
the interviewee's graduate school experience. Experiences described by Penny and Trent are provided for illustration.

Penny had not returned to graduate school after she had completed her general examination. Her father had died, and she had been quite active working in her school after general exams. On her "break," she went with a group of work associates for a weekend in New York to attend the theatre and generally "unwind." In the lobby of her hotel she "stumbled upon" her advisor who wondered if she was in New York for a convention for ____. She had to admit that she was not. On the plane transporting her back to Columbus, Penny found that her advisor was also on the same plane. At some point in flight, her advisor came over to her seat and asked Penny when she thought she would get started working on her dissertation. She asked when she could have an appointment with her advisor. Immediately her advisor produced his schedule book and suggested that they meet the very next day. Penny indicated that had this serendipitous incident not occurred, she might not have started on her dissertation for many months.

Trent was working in a rural school district near Columbus and was also taking a post-Master's course at The Ohio State University to get credentialing needed for renewing his certification. Unbeknown to him, the professor teaching the course Trent was taking recognized Trent as a prospective doctoral student. Again, without Trent's knowledge, the professor visited the superintendent and some of Trent's supervisors to verify those administrators' opinions of Trent. After getting positive feedback from them, the professor met with Trent for coffee several times during the next
month to try to convince him to enter the doctoral program. At first Trent indicated that he thought he had suffered enough in getting his Master's degree, and he did not plan to suffer any more. Several weeks later after several meetings for coffee in the a.m., Trent finally made the decision to enter the doctoral program.

Less than one year after earning his doctorate, the researcher interviewed Trent. To date he has won a national first prize for his dissertation, has published in state and national newsletters and journals, and has been asked to critique publications in his area of specialization. He has also been a consultant for his former school district and has given excellent assistance regarding a particular issue of concern in that district.

Trent told the interviewer that he never dreamed that he would be relating all these accomplishments to the researcher. But he said that those meetings with the professor for coffee started the whole process.

Some interviewees described several incidents which resulted in a meaningful turning point. Some interviewees interpreted their graduate school experiences as being comprised of many kismetic moments; others felt they had had only one or two; others believed that such moments do not actually occur or just felt that they had never experienced any within the context of their particular experience. For Walt, just about all experiences were kismetic moments.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This two-part study was conducted to explore the perspectives of Ph.D. students who participated in this research through their responses to questions in the following categories: (1) relationships with others, especially the advisor; (2) processes involved in students' doctoral endeavors; and (3) significant experiences.

Part A, a 15-item survey questionnaire, was sent to 214 doctoral candidates and graduates in the academic fields of adult and vocational-technical education, educational administration, educational foundations and research, and student personnel in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. Initial survey and follow-up efforts resulted in an analysis of 170 respondents in two sections: (1) a descriptive profile of respondents and (2) an analysis of responses to questions concerning the advisor and significant other persons who assisted in doctoral students' dissertation endeavors.

One purpose of Part A of the study was to obtain a sampling for the 30 interviews, Part B of the study. The sampling stratification for Part B included dissertation stage and sex. To insure that the differences, if any, between the experiences of men and women would be presented in the data, convenience samples of 15 women
and 15 men were used. Other considerations for interviewee selection included: area of education, proximity, age range, satisfaction level, and employment. The remainder of this chapter consists of a summary of major findings, recommendations for future research, and implications for graduate programs.

**Summary of Major Findings**

**Part A.** As indicated in the tables, analyses of the descriptive profile of respondents and the responses to questions concerning the advisor and significant other persons showed the following:

1. **Age range.** Median age range for respondents fell within ages 35 to 38. Table 4 indicates that 8.2 percent of the females were over fifty while no males were over fifty.

2. **Area of education.** Table 5 indicates that in Educational Administration approximately two males responded for every female. In Educational Foundations and Research, 54.7 percent of the respondents were females and 32.2 percent were males. Percentages of men and women responding to the survey questionnaire in Adult and Vocational-Technical Education and Student Personnel were approximately equal.

3. **Dissertation stage.** Approximately 51 percent of the males and 57 percent of the females returning this questionnaire had completed requirements for the Ph.D. The next largest category included those working on proposals. Table 6 shows that 27.3 percent of the males and 20.0 percent of the females were working on proposals.
4. **Same-different dissertation advisor.** Table 8 indicates that the dissertation advisor was different from the general examination advisor for 13.1 percent of the males and 14.0 percent of the females who responded to the survey questionnaire.

5. **Residence location.** Table 1 indicates that 32.3 percent of the females and 76.3 percent of the males who had completed residency requirements and agreed to have interviews lived outside Columbus and vicinity. No "qualified" males in student personnel resided in Ohio.

6. **Professional participation with advisor.** Table 9 shows that from the 170 responses to the survey questionnaire, 94 respondents or slightly over fifty-five percent indicated that they had had no professional participation with their advisors.

7. **Contact with advisor.** Men and women working in early stages indicated more frustrations and dissatisfactions than later stage respondents. While 53.5 percent of the males and 43.3 percent of the females in later stages had met with their advisors more than five times in the last six months, Table 11 indicates that only 19.2 percent of the males and 34.6 percent of the females working in early stages had met with their advisors more than five times in the last six months.

8. **Influence of advisor on topic selection.** "Very influential, but did not determine the topic" was the response of 43.1 percent of the men and 41.7 percent of the women who were later stage Ph.D. candidates and graduates. Whether or not selection of the topic was based on the advisee's background and was a rather independent
choice, or the topic was selected out of mutual interests, or was primarily based on the advisor's interest; the advisor, in the majority of cases, seemed to have had a definite influence on the topic transformation or refinement.

9. Satisfaction with advisor's help on dissertation. "Very satisfied," as illustrated by Table 13, was the most frequent response by both early and later stage dissertation respondents. Over sixty-nine percent of the men and fifty-five percent of the women in later stages indicated that they were "very satisfied."

10. Other person(s) who was/her helpful for dissertation progress. "Reading committee members" was the most popular response for both men and women in early and later stages. Over 48 percent of the males and 40 percent of the females in later stages checked only that category. Persons enumerated in the blanks included professors not on the committee, work associates, fellow graduate students, and professional consultants. Spouses were mentioned by only three out of the 170 respondents.

11. Differences between men and women. Early stage females perceived that their advisors had less influence on topic selection than early stage males and later stage males and females. They were also less satisfied than men with the help given by the advisor on the dissertation.

Part B. None of the interviews proceeded in order from questions one through ten. (See pages 65 and 66 for details concerning the interview procedures.) The following findings were based on responses to
both random commentaries and the ten interview questions:

1. Relationships with advisors and dissertation committee members varied from very close to barely casual.

2. Frustration arose when advisors and committee members did not meet expectations of the interviewees. In some cases, interviewees felt they had received treatment less than they had expected in collegial-peer relationships. Only one interviewee out of the thirty reported a collegial relationship with her dissertation advisor.

3. While the survey questionnaire indicated that only 13.1 percent of the male respondents and 14.0 percent of the female respondents had different dissertation advisors, several interviewees who had completed their Ph.D. requirements realized that in retrospect it would have been advisable for them to have considered different advisors. One recommended that an orientation for discussing committee "mix" would be helpful.

4. A number of doctoral students received meaningful help on their dissertations from persons other than their advisors and committee members; however, this assistance was merely a supplement to the official help they received from their advisors and the committee.

5. Some employed professional consultants, such as statisticians, research designers, and editors to help in technical phases.

6. Help from support groups was deemed significant in some instances.
7. Most of those interviewed felt that the doctoral dissertation process had been difficult.

8. Topic refinement and dissertation writing were substantial frustrations to most. In spite of these frustrations, many felt pleased with their dissertation efforts when the process was completed.

9. The dissertation time schedule was difficult for many.

10. Interviewees who were not on campus and worked full time—especially those who lived out of state—had more difficulty completing their dissertations than those who stayed on campus or were not employed until the dissertation was completed.

11. Some felt they would under similar circumstances perform differently or assign different priorities to various stages of the dissertation.

12. The doctoral program, including dissertation, was an economic burden for some, and for some was disruptive of family life and other personal relationships.

13. Nineteen out of thirty interviewees, or approximately 63 percent, reported that they had experienced malaise, physical and/or emotional reactions to the general and/or the final oral examinations.

14. Those who were using word processors to write their dissertations expressed satisfaction with that technology.

15. While the computer was intended to be a meaningful tool to help the doctoral candidate, several indicated great frustrations resulted from events encountered at the computer center.

16. Employment and placement were concerns expressed by some in later stages who had not yet graduated and several who had the
doctorate but were not employed. These interviewees felt that either the advisor or the College of Education should be more active in assisting with employment options.

17. Some graduates already are engaged in further research, and many expressed a desire to pursue further research.

18. Some interviewees did not experience kismetic moments; for others, one, several, or many kismetic moments occurred.

19. Ten of the fifteen women interviewees, about 66 percent, appeared to have special problems and/or they perceived their doctoral experiences different from the fifteen male interviewees.

20. Five students who had indicated on the survey questionnaire that their advisors had had no influence on their dissertation topic selection reported during the interviews that their advisors did not try to understand their topics or lacked the expertise to work with them on the topics. Several of these interviewees resolved their problems by seeking assistance from either other committee members or professional consultants. The researcher would have had a broader context to interpret the results if the perspectives of both advisors and advisees had been possible.

21. Degree of satisfaction with dissertation committee members was, in most cases, the second most significant element that influenced interviewee satisfaction with the dissertation experience.

22. Satisfaction with the doctoral program, particularly the dissertation experience, was directly related to the interviewee's satisfaction with his/her advisor.
Discussion of Major Outcomes

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the data collected and summarized above, the following major outcomes are discussed around the three foci for the study: (1) relationships with others, especially the advisor, (2) the processes involved in students' doctoral endeavors, and (3) significant experiences.

Relationships with others, especially the advisor

1. In this study advisors, committee members, professors not on the committee, professional consultants, peers/graduate students, work associates/supervisors, and friends/spouses were identified by students as offering professional assistance and/or personal support. While the literature often refers to the importance of the advisor in graduate education, for the most part, only occasionally are committee members mentioned. Spouses and professional consultants, considered quite important by a number of interviewees, have not previously been cited in studies concerning graduate education.

2. Satisfaction with the doctoral program, particularly the dissertation experience, directly relates to the advisee's satisfaction with his/her advisor. Katz and Hartnett (1976), who compiled extensive data from research studies which focused on graduate education, support this finding.

3. Dissatisfaction with the advisor seemed to be linked with expectation-reality discrepancy (ERD). Gregg (1973) found that ERD (scored for high advisor dissatisfaction) was a considerably better negative predictor of academic satisfaction for males than females;
in fact, for females the correlation coefficients were very close to zero. He also indicated that sex appeared to have a considerable effect on the association between ERD and satisfaction. Gregg offered the following as a possible explanation: "...females enter graduate school with less definite or clear-cut expectations for graduate school than do males, and therefore, the impact of ERD would be less for females" (p. 498).

This researcher observed that ERD and advisor dissatisfaction appeared more in interviews with women than men. Several women interviewees, for example, were dissatisfied because their advisors maintained with them what the females considered to be either a teacher-pupil or a master-apprentice relationship. Each, on the other hand, had expected to have a colleague-colleague relationship. Since only one out of the thirty persons interviewed reported having a collegial relationship with her advisor, the findings of this study do not agree with Gregg who concluded that "...collegiality was found to be slightly better as a predictor of academic satisfaction than of nonacademic satisfaction. The most notable exception to this is female students" (pp. 491-492).

4. Associated with the noncollegiality factor is the topic of professional participation with the advisor. Ninety-four respondents or 55.3 percent out of 170 indicated on the survey questionnaire that they had had no participation with their advisors during their doctoral program. Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain (1982) suggest that the advisor and advisee publish together. While over two-thirds of the interviewees had graduated, none reported having
aspirations of co-authoring and publishing with his/her advisor. One advisee indicated that the advisor had suggested that they co-publish an article, but the interviewee revealed that she would never do that since her research was the result of her own labor and the help of professional consultants. Several graduates have sought advice and have been active as consultants with their advisors.

5. The formation of and the group dynamics of dissertation committees is a new frontier for graduate education research. The review of the literature reveals that Bargar and Duncan (1982) and Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain (1982) recognize the importance of committee composition and interaction. No actual research studies until now have explored how students perceive the committee component.

6. Some students discerned that committee members were chosen for their professional expertise. Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain (1982) indicated that the committee could provide a peer networking function. None of the interviewees reported encountering that function, although they did recognize that a non-adversary relationship among members can be quite important for expediting the completion of the dissertation.

Selection of the members of the committee, as indicated in The Graduate School Handbook "...is the responsibility of the advisor..." (p. 45). In some cases the advisor's choice may be a detriment for the advisee. An advisor, for example, selected a committee member because of his renowned expertise. Never having
taken courses from that professor on the committee, the student reported that the professor considered the student "out of the field" and was unwilling to help with the dissertation drafts. Finally the problem was resolved when the advisee hired an outside consultant.

8. Other findings revealed that while diversity of expertise is a fundamental strength of a committee, the committee process did not always lead to harmonious consensus. At worst, committee members were perceived as casual members who barely read the chapter drafts; at best, committee members were perceived as being supportive experts.

The processes involved in students' doctoral endeavors

The second focus of major outcomes includes the following areas: (1) rites of passage, (2) dissertation writing, and (3) special problems of women.

1. Rites of passage. Although the literature has very little to say about the general examination and the final oral examination, Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain (1982) refer to these examinations as "rites of passage" and discuss their significance:

   The general exams can be a vital focal point and rite of passage for the developmental processes.... Ideally the general exam preparation provides a time to sort out what has been learned, to memorize what is necessary, and to organize the rest into a coherent platform for dissertation research and later practice (p. 7).

   The second part of the general examination, the oral, they say represents "...a focal point for the examination process" (p. 8).
The final oral examination, popularly called "the oral defense," has many parallels with the oral part of the general examination. Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain further indicate:

The dissertation defense has a unique quality in that it is the final rite of passage for the student. The intensity of effort is at its greatest pitch, and the expectations for success and acceptance into the 'elite society' are at their highest level. The event does call for celebration... (pp. 11-12).

No studies in graduate education have explored the perceptions of graduate students concerning their experiences with the general and the final oral examination processes. Malaisia was the term coined by the researcher to describe the trauma associated with the general and the final oral examinations. This study found that a number of students had had traumatic experiences, primarily on either or both the oral part and/or the written part of the general examination. Some students also experienced emotional and physical reactions to the final oral examination. Those who had had problems with the general examination sometimes had positive experiences with the final oral examination.

Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain (1982) and Sternberg (1981) refer to the "post-partum" depression following the dissertation completion. This study found that some students experienced a psychological "slump" following the general examination. After completing the oral defense, some students also experienced a period of depression lasting from two weeks to over a year.
2. **Dissertation writing.** Major outcomes of dissertation writing include three categories: (a) topic selection, (b) writing frustration, and (c) research aspirations.

   a. **Topic selection.** No studies have been conducted to determine the advisor-advisee interactive processes relating to how doctoral students select their dissertation topics. The bibliography in Appendix F includes some sources which are designed to guide doctoral students from topic selection through final draft completion; however, these books offer limited examples of how topics are selected and omit the components of advisor-advisee interaction.

   This study found that whether or not selection of the topic was based on the advisee's background and was a rather independent choice, or the topic was selected out of mutual interests, or was primarily based on the advisor's interest, the advisor seems to have had a definite influence on the topic being transformed into something that is considered "focused," "manageable," "narrowed," "refined," "re-oriented," "reshaped," or "workable."

   b. **Writing frustration.** No previous studies have explored the perceptions of graduate students concerning the process of writing their dissertations. This study revealed that no dissertation is without its problems. (Even Opal, who described her dissertation as being "a breeze," had difficulty refining her topic.) Rewriting is a normal process for the dissertation endeavor. Often the study will change and a draft will have to be rewritten to accommodate those alterations. Doctoral students need to realize that every dissertation will have certain problems. Topic refinement and dissertation writing were
substantial frustrations to most. In spite of these frustrations, many felt pleased with their dissertation efforts when the process was completed.

c. Research aspirations. "...more than one quarter of all full-time academics have never published a scholarly word...." This quote is based on a nationwide survey of faculty members in American colleges and universities (Council of Graduate Schools, 1977). Spriesterbach and Henry (1978) pose this question: "How culpable...is the dissertation experience in effecting this ironic result?" (p. 53).

Interviewees in this study who had completed their dissertations responded very positively to the question, "Do you believe your dissertation experience has prepared you for future research?" Graduates usually qualified their answer by saying that they felt very competent about pursuing research of the type they had engaged in for their dissertation endeavors.

Of the thirty interviewed, one had published a book, eleven had published articles ranging from scholarly to popular publications, sixteen expressed the desire to publish eventually, and two indicated that they had no desire to publish. One of the two not interested in publishing was involved with media presentations on radio and television. Overall, research aspirations of interviewees were very positive.

3. Special problems of women. This study found that ten out of fifteen women interviewees, approximately 66 percent, appeared to have special problems and/or they perceived their doctoral experiences differently from the fifteen male interviewees. These findings tend to agree with Roby (1972), Feldman (1974), Adler (1976), Solomon
(1976), and Tittle and Denker (1980).

All women interviewees in this study had been working for at least the last five years in a professional and educational area. None were displaced homemakers.

Expectation-reality discrepancy, previously treated under "Relationships with the Advisor," was an element, especially relating to collegiality, that three women perceived as a factor of dissatisfaction. Other special problems faced by women in this study included situational and psychological obstacles. Women interviewees often referred to the fact that time management had been a major problem for completing their dissertations. Those who were married and worked full time perceived their situations to be even more intensified. The majority of women interviewees described during the course of the interview the time they were required to spend on domestic and personal tasks. Only three male interviewees mentioned such tasks. Adler (1976) also found that women had less time for research and study because much of their time involved housework, shopping, commuting, personal care, and child care.

Psychological obstacles resulted in two sub-categories of major findings for this study: (1) commitment priority and (2) psychological-ecological "space." Commitment priority, a basic element leading to successful completion of the dissertation, included giving the dissertation endeavor precedence in time and importance, disengaging from relationships and activities which were not supportive of the dissertation, and making the dissertation the focus of concerted effort. Women perceived that commitment priority was a terrific
struggle and an absolute necessity. Perceptions concerning commit- ment priority were not articulated as intensely, if at all, by the majority of male interviewees.

Psychological-ecological "space" was observed by the interviewer to present problems for seven out of fifteen interviewees. While the seven women interviewees perceived that the dissertation endeavor required commitment priority, they were unable to "free" themselves psychologically from the "mainstream" of their home environment. Six of the seven worked in the dining room area which was halfway between kitchen and living room activities. The seventh woman worked on a couch/coffee table area. Two of the seven had a baby or a baby and toddler in the immediate area. By not having a very private, isolated area in which to work on the dissertation, each of the seven women interviewees appeared to have difficulty in maintaining a systematic, ongoing rhythm-and-flow for dissertation pre-writing, writing, and rewriting. Two mentioned that they had to transport all their dissertation materials whenever formal meals, such as Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners were planned. The interviewer learned that five out of the above-mentioned seven had husbands with private office areas in their homes. No studies have been conducted which explore psychological-ecological "space."

Six of the women interviewees were married to professionals. Four of them have husbands with Ph.D. degrees. At least three out of the four husbands are graduate school advisors and thus have a realistic perspective concerning the dissertation process. One husband in particular was extremely helpful in allowing his wife
to work sixteen hours a day in her "workroom" so that she could
finish writing her book which just was published. Child care and
household tasks were performed by him for nearly a year. Several
other women found that husbands were not supportive, at least in
early dissertation stages. In several cases, women interviewees
received personal support from women friends and support groups, rather
than their husbands. No study has been conducted which focuses on the
perceptions of women facing special problems with spouses during the
dissertation writing process.

Significant experiences

The third focus, significant experiences, includes two areas:
(1) research euphoria and (2) kismetic moments.

1. Research euphoria was a phenomenon observed by the inter­
viewer. Certain graduates expressed an exhilaration or "high" when
discussing the pride, delight, and/or satisfaction that they felt
when they described their dissertation in its completed form. While
several perceived that their dissertations were probably not "earth
shattering" in terms of the universe of research, they were quite
proud to have "created" them. One used the words, "It was like
making a baby." Four interviewees took great pleasure in literally
producing their dissertations for the interviewer to study. These
interviewees seemed very enthusiastic about explaining the complexities
of certain aspects of their organization, statistical tables, and
other challenges they had faced during their endeavors. No other
studies describe this phenomenon.
2. **Kismet moments** was the phrase coined by the researcher which was derived from the Turkish word *qismet*, meaning "fate or destiny." Kismet moments added richness to the study and usually represented a meaningful turning point in the interviewee's graduate school experience. Some interviewees described several incidents which resulted in a meaningful turning point. Some interviewees interpreted their graduate school experience as being comprised of many kismet moments; others felt they had had only one or two; others believed that such moments do not actually occur or just felt that they had never experienced any within the context of their particular experience. While kismet moments have been described by educators such as Ross L. Mooney (1969), no study until now has described this phenomenon as it directly relates to perceptions of doctoral students in graduate school.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

1. A study using other academic fields of education, such as Humanities Education, Industrial Technology, and Middle and Early Childhood Education could be conducted to determine whether or not there are differences within other student populations.

2. An expansion of the present study could investigate the differences between perceptions of doctoral graduates and permanent ABD's. Focus could be on preparation and trauma related to the general examination experience.

3. A study could focus on the relationship between doctoral student expectations and advisor satisfaction.
4. A comparative study could be made to explore the perceptual differences between doctoral students who write their dissertations while holding associateships and those who work full time at other universities, state departments of education, and public school settings while completing the writing of their dissertations.

5. A study could explore personality factors in advisor-advisee relationships.

6. A study of the perceptions of doctoral advisors regarding differences in advising male and female doctoral students and advisees at different stages of development could provide needed information for establishing faculty development programs in graduate education.

7. A study could be conducted to explore doctoral advisors' perceptions concerning advisor-advisee relationships.

8. A study focusing on the trauma of the general examination would be an area of further research.

9. A study could be conducted to explore the impact of adult developmental stages on the pursuit of doctoral work.

10. A longitudinal study would be useful to determine how Ph.D. graduates' perceptions of their doctoral experiences change over time.

11. A longitudinal study could be made to explore how the dissertation writing influences doctoral graduates' professional endeavors over five and ten years.
Implications for Graduate Programs

Since satisfaction with the doctoral program, particularly the dissertation experience, was directly related to the interviewee's satisfaction with his/her advisor, there should be more emphasis placed on graduate advisement.

Perhaps recruitment of faculty should include major emphasis on interpersonal, as well as professional skills. It would appear that the university reward system "pays off" more for those who publish, get grants, and maintain large class enrollments.

It would seem that often the only experience that a novice professor has with dissertation advisement is based on his/her own dissertation experience. A concerted effort by department chairs to help the novice professor might include placing that professor in a type of internship under a senior professor--or better still, perhaps the talents of emeritus professors could be utilized for initiating the novice. Informal seminars on the topic of advisor-advisee developmental processes also would be helpful.

For the typical professor who teaches, does research, and advises doctoral students, it might also be desirable to have assistance with some of the more procedural aspects so that the advisor can devote his valuable time to working on more philosophical, substantive issues with the advisee. A person who might meet these needs is the dissertation coordinator.

A dissertation coordinator could assist both professors and graduate students by:
1. Conducting orientation sessions for doctoral students just entering the program. Speakers could include doctoral candidates who have recently taken their general examinations.

2. Clarifying graduate school procedures and requirements.

3. Presenting workshops in which doctoral students could discuss how they selected and refined their topics.

4. Conducting workshops addressing ongoing methodological problems which students face as they conduct their research.

5. Providing students with information concerning using the word processor, the computer center, and library resources.

6. Assisting professors who request that their advisees receive help in editing procedures, scholarly style, and draft format.

7. Providing graduate students with names of professional consultants, such as editors, research statisticians and designers, and other specialists.

8. Informing students of dissertation support groups and advisee seminars.

9. Conducting workshops for spouses of doctoral candidates to help them understand the malaisia of the process. Other spouses would be key participants.

10. Presenting informal seminars on writing research. Books listed in Appendix F could be the readings for the seminar. Key participants would include professors and doctoral students presently engaged in writing research.

Students in this study seemed to select The Ohio State University most often because of its academic reputation or because it was close
to home and work. Although some students reported that they had read the catalogues and had interviewed with department chairpersons and faculty members, it would seem that more should be done to acquaint prospective students with the environmental milieu of the department before they elect to enter the program. To gain better insight and more realistic expectations of the department environment, prospective students should meet with other graduate students who have been in the program.

After the student enters the program, orientation should include a number of activities with faculty, advanced students, and peer support groups. More extensive endorsements along these lines are recommended by Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain (1982) as follows:

1. Provide orientation experiences for new students....
2. Create an ongoing 'developmental' or 'advisory' seminar for students....
3. Create peer groups as needed for specific purposes....
4. Encourage and provide opportunities for students to present and discuss their dissertation material in formal meetings prior to the oral defense....
5. Encourage, and when possible, join students in publishing and presenting the results of the student's research (pp. 12-13).

These activities, together with the skillful support of the advisor, committee members, and other professionals, should provide conditions that can foster optimal development of scholars.
APPENDIX A

APPROVAL - HUMAN SUBJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
ACTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

With regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research entitled: DOCTORAL RESEARCH AND SPONSORSHIP AT THE PH.D. LEVEL IN EDUCATION AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Robert R. Bargar, Mary E. Daniels-Nelson listed as the principal investigator.

Educational Foundations & Research

THE SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES REVIEW COMMITTEE HAS TAKEN THE FOLLOWING ACTION:

☑ Approved
☐ Disapproved
☐ Approved with conditions*
☐ Waiver of Written Consent Granted

*Conditions stated by the Committee have been met by the investigator and, therefore the protocol is approved.

It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to retain a copy of each signed consent form for at least four (4) years beyond the termination of the subject's participation in the proposed activity. Should the principal investigator leave the University, signed consent forms are to be transferred to the Human Subject Review Committee for the required retention period. This application has been approved for the period of one year. You are reminded that you must promptly report any problems to the Review Committee, and that no procedural changes may be made without prior review and approval. You are also reminded that the identity of the research participants must be kept confidential.

Date Oct. 29, 1982 Signed: /s/ L. D. Schmidt
Chairperson

cc: Original - Investigator File

HS-0258 (Rev. 7/81)
APPENDIX B

SURVEY COMMUNICATIONS, QUESTIONNAIRE, AND INTERVIEW PARTICIPATION FORM
An exploratory study to determine the nature of advisor-advisee relationships at the doctoral level is underway at The Ohio State University. Although both professors and graduate students consider such relationships to be important for fostering academic growth, the academic community possesses little information about the interactions that typify such relationships nor the impacts that those interactions have.

We are asking recent or soon-to-be graduate Ph.D.'s at The Ohio State University in Adult and Occupational-Educational Administration, Educational Foundations and Research, and Student Personnel to help create a knowledge base specific to advisor-advisee relationships.

Your observations concerning your dissertation experience could add to our understanding of the dynamics of such advisor-advisee interactions. We hope you, as a graduate student in the area of Educational Foundations and Research, will assist in this effort by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it by December 28, 1982. This questionnaire phase of the study will be followed by in-depth interviews. If you have the time and inclination, we hope you will volunteer for the interview phase.

We are very concerned about maintaining the anonymity of respondents and at the same time obtaining the highest possible response rate. You will notice a number in the upper right corner of the questionnaire. This number is related to our method of communicating to non-respondents. At no time will you be identified with your responses. All data will be reported in aggregate form. Further, no evaluation comparisons will be made between educational areas.

We believe you will find participation in this research effort to be a worthwhile contribution of your time. A summary of the findings will be forwarded to you in due course. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Berger

Robert R. Berger, Professor

Mary Daniels-Nelson, Doctoral Candidate
Phase One of the data collection stage of our research concerning the nature of advisor-advisee relationships at the doctoral level is drawing to a close. Considerable interest has been shown by persons directly involved in such interactions. We, of course, want these findings to be as accurate as possible.

As of this date, we have not received your completed survey. We are aware of your busy schedule and realize that our request may have slipped your mind. We remain hopeful, however, that you will choose to assist in this effort and, in addition, will possibly be able to participate in an interview.

For your convenience another survey, interview form, and stamped return envelope are enclosed. Your response by April 1 would be appreciated.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. Best wishes for both an enjoyable and a productive year.

Sincerely,

Dr. Robert R. Zargar
Professor

Ms. Mary Daniels-Nelson
Ph.D. Candidate
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PH.D. CANDIDATES AND GRADUATES IN EDUCATION

PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE STATEMENT(S):

FILL IN BLANKS WHERE APPROPRIATE.

Sex: □ Male □ Female

Age:
□ Under 30 years □ 39-42 years
□ 30-34 years □ 43-46 years
□ 35-38 years □ 47-50 years
□ Over 50 years

Employment
□ Employed on campus.
□ As a teaching, research, or administration associate.
□ Have a fellowship.
□ As a full-time department employee.
□ Employed off campus.
□ Work 20 hrs. or more per week.
□ Work less than 20 hrs. per week.
□ Not employed.

If employed, please indicate present occupation:

Area of Education
□ Adult and Vocational-Technical
□ Educational Administration
□ Educational Foundations and Research
□ Student Personnel

Dissertation Stage
□ Working on proposal.
□ Proposal accepted. Work begun on study.
□ Analyzing/interpreting data.
□ Writing final chapters.
□ Have completed requirements for the Ph.D.

Professional Participation with Advisor
□ Addressed a professional group.
□ Assisted in a research project.
□ Co-authored a publication.
□ Other: ____________________________

□ Presented off-campus instruction.
□ Taught in advisor’s class.
□ No participation with advisor.

Approximate Number of Contacts with Your Advisor in the Last Six Months

to Discuss Your Dissertation

□ Five times or less.
□ More than five times.

Comment on duration of meetings and degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Over)
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PH.D. CANDIDATES AND GRADUATES IN EDUCATION (Continued)

PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE STATEMENT(S):

□ Determined the topic
□ Very influential, but did not determine the topic.
□ Somewhat influential.
□ Had no influence.

Please explain the nature of this contribution:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Degree of Satisfaction with Advisor's Help on Dissertation

□ Very satisfied
□ Somewhat satisfied.
□ Not satisfied at all.
□ Very satisfied.

Comment or explain:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

OTHER Person(s) Who Was/Were Helpful for Your Dissertation Process

□ Reading committee member(s).
□ Professor not on reading committee.
□ Other(s):

Explain how person(s) was/were helpful:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Continued)
Would you be willing to discuss in depth some of your dissertation experiences? If so, please sign your name and indicate an appropriate time and date to telephone for an audio tape interview appointment.

NAME

ADDRESS

TELEPHONE (_____)

DAY(S) TO CALL

TIME(S) TO CALL

If you will be unable to participate in an interview, please return this completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-free envelope.

Thank you again for your time and response.
APPENDIX C

HUMAN SUBJECT CONSENT FORM
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

DOCTORAL CANDIDATES' AND GRADUATES' PERCEPTIONS OF ADVISOR-ADVISEE
RELATIONSHIPS IN SELECTED AREAS OF EDUCATION AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

SARGAR/DANIELS-NELSON
(Principal Investigator)

explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential unless I specifically agree otherwise by placing my initials here.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ___________________________ Signed: ___________________________

(Participant)

Signed: ___________________________

(Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative)

Signed: ___________________________

(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - if Required)

Witness: ___________________________

85-027 (Rev. 12-81) — To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.
APPENDIX D

RESPONDENTS' PRESENT OCCUPATIONS
MALE RESPONDENTS' PRESENT EMPLOYMENT

Assistant Dean, Graduate School in a state university in Ohio
Operations Planner
Acting Dean of a regional campus of a state university in Ohio
Classroom Teacher
Superintendent of Schools
Principal
Ohio Department of Education
Assistant Principal
Employed in a public school system in Texas
Currently Superintendent of Schools and finishing dissertation
Staff Assistant
Vocational Counselor
Industrial Training Director
School Superintendent
Director of Staff Development for a Public School District
Consultant for Department of Education in Ohio
Administrative Associate to Dean of Program Development
Training Manager
Superintendent of Schools
Manager of Instructional Support Services and Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction
Assistant Professor
Educational Testing Services, Program III, New Jersey
Part-time College Instructor
MALE RESPONDENTS' PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (continued)

Professor
Sales Training/Design Specialist
Teacher Educator at a university
Research Consultant, Office of Occupational Development in Indiana
Vice President for Student Life
Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs at a university in Florida
College Professor
School District Superintendent
Part-time Pastor; Do counseling and seminars
Administrator
Consultant to Statistics Department
Graduate Teaching Associate in Department of Mathematics
Student earning hourly wages
Cattle Rancher in a foreign country
Teacher
Lecturer--temporary
Elementary Principal
Graduate Teaching Associate, OSU/Instructor, Columbus Technical Institute
Research and Development
Minister
Administrator
Assistant Dean, Department Chair and Lecturer
Educational Administrator
MALE RESPONDENTS' PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (continued)

College Administrator
Assistant Superintendent in a public school district in Ohio
Graduate Administrative Associate/Academic Counselor
High School Principal
Executive Assistant to the Superintendent in a public school system in Nebraska
Superintendent of Schools
Marketing--Sales
Educational Administrator in a correctional institution
Teacher Educator
Training Sector/Private Industry "Training Services Industry Specialist"
Assistant Professor
Administration in a university in Missouri
Gifted Education Coordinator
Director of Personnel and Training
Volunteer Chair representing foreign students in a university in Virginia
FEMALE RESPONDENTS' PRESENT EMPLOYMENT

Educational Consultant for Cooperative Educational Service Agency in Georgia

Vice President Community Relations

Research and Testing Specialist for Civil Service Commission

Career Education Coordinator in a public school system in the state of Washington

Instructor in a junior college

Own a new business. Was a GRA for several years.

Director of Head Start in an Ohio public school system

Guidance Counselor

Hospital Administrator

College Instructor

Career Center Instructor in a high school

Administrator in a Cooperative Education Program

Education Administrator

Chairperson, Division of Nursing and Allied Health in a community college

College Professor

Family Education Coordinator for Cooperative Extension Service

Assistant Professor

Hall Director

Academic Counselor

Consultant/Entrepreneur

Associate Director, Office of Continuing Education

Head of Outreach and Research in a North Carolina School of Science and Math
FEMALE RESPONDENTS' PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (continued)

Assistant Director, Office of Research and Development Services

Director, Black Cultural Resources Center of Minority Affairs and
Adjunct Professor in an Ohio state university

Substitute Teacher

Media Director for a public school system in a Columbus suburb

Director of the Junior League/Program for the Gifted in a private
college in Ohio

Instructor of Biomedical Communications

Director of Nursing; Private Practice--Sex and Marital Therapy

Assistant Professor of Textiles and Clothing

Dean's Staff in College of Education, Office of Program Development

Assistant Dean of Students

Associate Director of Placement at a state university in Ohio

Supervisor for a state department of education; Exceptional Children

Assistant Professor, Department of Special Education in a private
university in Ohio

Administrator, Ohio Board of Regents

Coordinator, Franklin County Department of Education

Assistant Professor at a university

Patient Education Coordinator in a Columbus hospital

Instructor in a two-year technical college

Training Officer

Athletic Academic Advisor

Career Education Coordinator in a public school system in Washington

Graduate Administrative Associate
FEMALE RESPONDENTS' PRESENT EMPLOYMENT (continued)

Department Chair, Parent and Child Health Graduate Program, College of Nursing and Health at a private university in Ohio

Graduate Research Associate; Assistant Editor for a quarterly publication

Systems Analyst

Educational Consultant

Public School Administrator

Teacher/Specialist

Graduate Research Associate

High School Teacher

Health Planner

Assistant Professor

Substitute Teaching

Editor/Staff Development Facilitator
APPENDIX E

RESPONDENTS' COMMENTS CONCERNING PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION WITH ADVISOR
Twice spoke to his class on research.

Developed a proposal for presentation with advisor.

Reviewed proposals for presentation and served as acting project evaluator for former advisor.

Have been preceptor for several of his students.

Will be addressing professional group and will publish with advisor.

Presentation, visiting foreign students.

We wrote a "joint" proposal to the U.S. Department of Education which was funded as a student research grant.

Assisted with several conferences.

Attended educational seminars.

Participation in planning-study group toward presentations and publications.

Graduate Research Associate. (Worked as Ford Foundation GRA.)

Helped me find employment.

Since graduation I addressed professional group, assisted in research project, co-authored a publication, and taught in advisor's class.

Worked as a GRA while at O.S.U.

Developed a microcomputer authoring system.

Ran orientation class for new doctoral students to assist advisor.

I have computed advisor's research publications twice.

Attended professional conference with advisor.

Served as administrative assistant.

In-service with teachers in local school district.

Worked with advisor as a teaching assistant.
Talking about completing a project.

I work more with another professor as a research associate.

Served on committee for WOSU and regularly discussed mutual research and professional interests.

Was assistant editor of a quarterly publication. My advisor is the editor.
APPENDIX F

RECOMMENDED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INTERVIEWEES
RECOMMENDED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INTERVIEWEES


The Ohio State University. Graduate School Handbook. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1981.
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